# Essential Writings on Race

Samuel Francis

Edited and Introduced by
Jared Taylor

# Essential Writings on Race

## SAMUEL FRANCIS

**Edited and Introduced by**
**JARED TAYLOR**

**New Century Foundation**

# Other titles from New Century Books:

Jared Taylor, Ed., *The Real American Dilemma: Race, Immigration, and the Future of America*, 1998

George McDaniel, Ed., *A Race Against Time: Racial Heresies for the 21st Century*, 2003

Michael Levin, *Why Race Matters: Race Differences and What They Mean*, 2005

Carleton Putnam, *Race and Reason: A Yankee View*, 2006

Steven Farron, *The Affirmative Action Hoax: Diversity, the Importance of Character, and Other Lies* (Second Edition), 2010

Jared Taylor, *White Identity: Racial Consciousness in the 21st Century*, 2011

Jared Taylor, *Paved With Good Intentions: The Failure of Race Relations in Contemporary America* (20th Anniversary Kindle Edition, 2014, based on First Carroll & Graf Edition, 1992)

## Published daily on the Internet:
## *American Renaissance*
## www.amren.com

Copyright © 2014 by New Century Foundation

All rights reserved. This book or any portion thereof may not be reproduced or used in any manner whatsoever without the express written permission of the publisher except for the use of brief quotations in a book review.

This Kindle edition is current as of May 22, 2014, and is based on the First New Century Books Edition, Copyright © 2007 by New Century Foundation.

Cover design by Kevin I. Slaughter
Kindle edition prepared by John Vawter

# Contents


Introduction

All Those Things to Apologize For
*Washington Times*

Why Race Matters
*American Renaissance*

Prospects for Racial and Cultural Survival
*American Renaissance*

The Roots of the White Man
*American Renaissance*

New Lies for Old
*American Renaissance*

Race and the American Identity
*American Renaissance*

The Origins of Racism
*American Renaissance*

The War on White Heritage
*American Renaissance*

Ethnopolitics: Ethnic and Racial Implications of the 2000 Election
*Social Contract*

The Christian Question
*Occidental Quarterly*

The Return of the Repressed
*Race and the American Prospect*

* * *

# Introduction

## by Jared Taylor

Samuel Todd Francis wrote brilliantly on a wide range of subjects—terrorism, politics, society, history, the South, literature, theory of elites—but he will be best known to future generations for what he wrote about the politics of race. He was his generation's most incisive theorist on this difficult subject, and he paid a high price for his determination to write the truth as he saw it.

Francis was born on April 29, 1947, and was reared in Chattanooga, Tennessee. He showed great ability as a student, winning citywide prizes for poetry and essays. He went to John Hopkins as an undergraduate and earned a Ph.D. in British history from the University of North Carolina. From 1977 to 1981, he was a specialist on terrorism and security at the Heritage Foundation in Washington, D.C., before joining the staff of Sen. John East, Republican of North Carolina.

When Senator East died in 1986, Francis found his true calling as a journalist and essayist, when he joined the *Washington Times* as an editorial writer. In both 1989 and 1990, he won the Distinguished Writing Award for Editorial Writing given by the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and in both years, he was a finalist for the Scripps Howard Foundation's Walker Stone Prize for editorial writing. He became a staff columnist for the *Washington Times*, and Creators Syndicate distributed his twice-weekly columns for national syndication.

When Francis began his career at the *Times*, the rules that govern what may be said and thought about race had already hardened into the rigid orthodoxy that continues today. Francis did not at first break those rules, not because he concealed his views, but because he wrote on other subjects. His opinions evolved, however, in directions that increasingly stretched the boundaries of orthodoxy.

For a few years, Francis seemed to live a charmed life. His national reputation not only made it difficult to fault him for increasingly dissident

views, it vastly increased the reach of those views. He thumbed his nose at dogma, writing one merrily subversive column after another—until the ax fell in 1995. The first two selections in this anthology are what finally provoked even the generally tolerant *Washington Times* to fire him. The circumstances are explained in the prefatory comments to each article.

It was a shock to Francis to lose his job and his livelihood, but he quickly landed on his feet. Friends stepped in with support, and although he lost his most prominent podium, he gained something that enriched us all: the freedom to write entirely as he pleased. He spent the next ten years—until his untimely death at only age 57—expanding his understanding of race and the role it plays in American and world events. Except for the two pieces that led to his dismissal, the essays in this collection date from the last decade of his life and reflect his most mature and unfettered writing on the subjects he cared about most.

Although the *Washington Times* never published Francis again, and many newspapers dropped his column, he had a large, loyal audience and many outlets for his work. He became editor of the *Citizens Informer*, published by the Council of Conservative Citizens, and book editor of the *Occidental Quarterly*. He continued as a contributing editor to *Chronicles*, and also appeared regularly on the Vdare.com website and as a featured essayist in *Middle American News*. He also wrote for the magazine of which I am editor, *American Renaissance*, where many of the articles in this collection first appeared.

During those years, Francis was the intellectual leader of a small but growing movement to awaken whites to the crisis they face, to alert them to what is at stake if they fail to defend their legitimate interests as a distinct people with a distinct culture. Francis and I were colleagues in this work, but also close friends. I could claim that privilege for perhaps the last 15 years of his life, and by the time he died there was no one—besides my family and coworkers—with whom I spoke more often.

I have written at length elsewhere about the man behind the body of work that influenced so many readers. (See "Sam Francis," *American Renaissance*, April 2005, and "Personal Recollections of Sam Francis," the *Occidental Quarterly*, Vol. 5, No. 2. Both are available online.) Those who did not know the man, however, may appreciate even a greatly abbreviated sketch.

Francis was famous for good conversation. Like so many brilliant men, he had an omnivorous curiosity and an apparently limitless memory. Although sometimes standoffish with strangers, he could delight his friends late into the night with insights on everything from Plautus to *Playboy*. There was no one with whom one could spend a more pleasant and instructive evening, and to enjoy his society was to feel oneself in the presence of one of the great minds of our time.

More than anyone I have known, Francis had a vivid sense of the present as a direct extension of the past. Unlike many people, whose Ph.D. is a labor undertaken for professional purposes and then set aside, Sam's historical learning reflected a real joy in knowing the past. He could observe his own times from a perspective that was rich with historical lessons and parallels. I believe it was his love of history, his pride in a heritage that stretched back to the Greeks, that gave him so clear a sense of the immense risks his country was running by accepting a view of race he knew was wrong.

Because he was so aware of these risks, Francis became increasingly annoyed with liberals who were blind to those risks, and with self-styled conservatives from whom he expected greater insight and honesty. It irked him to be unable to persuade others of the truth of what seemed obvious, and an aroused Francis could write so bluntly it could startle even his admirers. But that was Sam Francis; in his hands, words were weapons.

Francis died on February 15, 2005, after a brief illness. He is buried in Chattanooga's Forest Hills Cemetery, in the shadow of Lookout Mountain. It is a fitting but melancholy place for a proud Southerner who always rode to the sound of the guns. There, on November 23, 1863, outnumbered Confederates fell back before Joe Hooker's men, thus ending the South's hopes of retaking Chattanooga.

Our generation will not produce another Sam Francis. The few who could have matched him in learning and brilliance will not have his courage; those who have his courage will lack his brilliance. Our work must go on without him, but we can still find wisdom and inspiration in the words he left with us.

Readers must understand that this is a selective collection that by no means captures the breadth of Francis's thinking. Some day, someone will compile the definitive anthology of his important writings on the theory of elites. Indeed, at the time of his death, Francis had begun a major historical

work that was to investigate how the nature of elite behavior contributed to the loss, among whites, of their capacity to understand and defend their interests. It is a great misfortune that Francis could not complete this synthesis of his two great intellectual passions. In the absence of what was to be his masterwork, I can say with confidence that this anthology—partial though it is—includes much of the work he hoped would be most enduring and influential.

Jared Taylor
Oakton, Virginia, July 27, 2007

* * *

* * *

# All Those Things to Apologize For

*Sam Francis was fired from his job at the* Washington Times *in two stages. Until mid-1995, he was both an editorial writer and a staff columnist, and his column was nationally syndicated. He wrote the following column for the June 27, 1995, issue, which led to the loss of his position as staff columnist and to a considerable cut in salary. He continued as an editorial writer, and his column continued to be nationally syndicated. However, instead of printing every column as had been its custom, the* Times *ran Francis's columns only at the editor's discretion*.

*Some people read this column as a justification of slavery. Francis always denied this, arguing that there was a clear difference between justifying slavery and pointing out—accurately—that the Bible never condemned it or called it a sin.*

*

"Christian theology," wrote Oswald Spengler, "is the grandmother of Bolshevism." By that gruff sentiment, the great German prophet of pessimism and the decline of the West meant that modern communism was merely the logical extension of what he and many others have taken to be the imperative of radical secular egalitarianism at the heart of the Christian message. Last week, the Southern Baptist Convention seemed finally to have caught up with the grandchildren its theology has spawned. The Southern Baptists, founded in 1845 in a schism with their Northern brethren over slavery, last week adopted a resolution expressing "repentance" for supporting slavery and racism 150 years before. Admittedly, that doesn't make them Bolsheviks, but it does place them on the path to a modernist, secularized, and socially radicalized vision of Christianity that breaks with their own traditions and history as well as with the historic meaning of the New Testament.

The resolution they adopted moans that "we lament and repudiate historic acts of evil such as slavery from which we continue to reap a bitter harvest," denounces American slavery as "particularly inhumane," and calls

on fellow Baptists to "genuinely repent of racism of which we have been guilty, whether consciously or unconsciously." After a good session of self-flagellation, the assembled repentants humbly kissed the toe of the only black minister in their leadership, who was pleased to accept their apology and enjoined them to sin no more.

But the self-abasement of the brethren over slavery and race ignores a good deal of Christian history, ethics, and theology. In the first place, the "repentance" of contemporaries for the sins of their fathers is ethically meaningless, since sin is committed by individual persons and not by groups, racial or religious. In the second place, what, precisely, is the "sin" of which the Baptists think they are so repentant?

If the sin is hatred or exploitation, they may be on solid grounds, but neither "slavery" nor "racism" as an institution is a sin. Indeed, there are at least five clear passages in the letters of Paul that explicitly enjoin "servants" to obey their masters, and the Greek words for "servants" in the original text are identical to those for "slaves." Neither Jesus nor the apostles nor the early church condemned slavery, despite countless opportunities to do so, and there is no indication that slavery is contrary to Christian ethics or that any serious theologian before modern times ever thought it was.

Not until the Enlightenment of the 18th century did a bastardized version of Christian ethics condemn slavery. Today we know that version under the label of "liberalism," or its more extreme cousin, communism. Hence, Spengler's genealogy of egalitarianism and the revolt against authority.

What has happened in the centuries since the Enlightenment is the permeation of the pseudo-Christian poison of equality into the tissues of the West, to the point that the mainstream churches now spend more time preaching against apartheid and colonialism than they do against real sins such as pinching secretaries and pilfering from the office coffee pool. The Southern Baptists, because they were fortunate enough to flourish in a region where the false sun of the Enlightenment never shone, succeeded in escaping this grim fate, at least until last week.

Now, having turned the corner on slavery and racism, we can look forward to the Baptists marching forward with the army of Progress. For fundamentalists in particular, that may be serious. You can dismiss the New Testament passages about slaves obeying their masters as irrelevant today,

but they happen to occur in the same places that enjoin other social responsibilities—such as children obeying their parents, wives respecting their husbands, and citizens obeying the law. If some passages are irrelevant, why should anyone pay attention to the others, and if you shouldn't, why not sign up with the feminists, the children's rights crusaders and—dare I suggest it—the Bolsheviks? So much for "Christian family values."

The contrition of the Southern Baptists for slavery and racism is a bit more than a politically fashionable gesture intended to massage race relations. It's a radical split from their own church traditions as well as from their determination to let the modern world go to hell by itself. Now that they've decided to join the parade toward that destination, we can expect them to adopt some even more modern resolutions that will pave the road for them.

*This column originally appeared in the June 27, 1995, issue of the* Washington Times, *page A23. It is reprinted with permission.* *Copyright © 1995 the* Washington Times *LLC. This reprint does not constitute or imply any endorsement or sponsorship of any product, service, company or organization.*

* * *

* * *

# Why Race Matters

## The assault on our race and culture must be met in explicitly racial terms.

*This article is adapted from remarks Sam Francis made at the first* American Renaissance *conference in May 1994. Dinesh D'Souza attended the conference and wrote a dishonest account of it for his 1995 book,* The End of Racism. *Fortunately, galleys of the book found their way into the hands of several conference speakers, who wrote indignant letters to Mr. D'Souza's publisher. His distortions were so grotesque that The Free Press destroyed the entire first print run of the book while Mr. D'Souza hurriedly wrote a corrected but still tendentious account of the conference*.

*On September 24, 1995, Mr. D'Souza published an op-ed piece in the* Washington Post *about the conference. By that time, Francis's remarks had been published in* American Renaissance, *so Mr. D'Souza managed to quote from them accurately as follows: "The civilization that we as whites created in Europe and America could not have developed apart from the genetic endowments of the creating people, nor is there any reason to believe that the civilization can be successfully transmitted to a different people." Otherwise, the op-ed article was as misleading as what had appeared in* The End of Racism.

*The appearance of Mr. D'Souza's article on the heels of the slavery column appears to have led to Francis's final dismissal from the* Times.

*

There is an old saying—supposedly an ancient Chinese curse: "May you live in interesting times." Today the curse has come true. The interesting times are here. What is most interesting about them is that for perhaps the first time in history, certainly for one of the few times in history, we are

witnessing the more or less peaceful transfer of power from one civilization and from the race that created and bore that civilization, to different races.

In South Africa, the transfer has already been completed, at least in a formal political sense, with the apparent support of most of the white population. In the remainder of what was once the common imperium of the European people in Africa and Asia, the transfer has long since taken place, occurring when the imperial powers withdrew or were chased out of the territories they had conquered.

In Europe the transfer has probably not quite yet begun on any major scale, and it probably will not begin until the immigration of non-whites is considerably further along than it is now. But in North America and more especially in the United States the transfer is well under way. It is in our own nation that the times are most interesting and therefore most cursed.

## Culture and Its Symbols

We see the transfer of power in almost every dimension of public and private life. Thus far, the transfer is more cultural than it is political or economic; it is clear in the rise of multi-culturalism, Afro-centrism, and the other anti-white cults and movements in university curricula, and in the penetration of even daily private life by the anti-white ethic and behavior these cults impose. It is clear in the ever-quickening war against the traditional symbols of the old civilization and the elevation of the symbols of the new peoples who aim at their displacement.

The Martin Luther King holiday in 1983 was the first and most important instance of the trend but by no means the last; indeed, it can be argued that the King holiday was merely the legitimizing agent of the attacks on other symbols that have occurred since. Attacks on the display of the Confederate battle flag and on other Confederate and Southern white symbols are now commonplace, but the Alamo in San Antonio is another traditional white symbol that is also under attack—by Hispanics. The Custer battlefield in Montana now celebrates the Indian victory, although what is historically memorable about the battle of the Little Big Horn is not the victory of several thousand Indians over a small American cavalry detachment but rather the defeat of whites at the hands of non-whites.

The holidays, public anniversaries, flags, songs, statues, museums, symbols, and heroes that a people shares are fundamental to its identity and its existence as a people. What we are witnessing on the official level of public culture in the attacks on these traditional symbols and their displacement by the symbols of other races is the effective abolition of one people and the gradual creation of another.

Of course, this process is not limited to official culture, which is often merely the plaything of politicians. It is also true even more clearly on the level of popular culture, by which is meant today not the culture created by the people but rather the culture created by elites for consumption by the people. Western movies now routinely define the whites as the villains and the Indians and Mexicans—or, even more fantastically, blacks—as the heroes or martyrs. Almost all TV and cinematic depictions of the Civil War now unequivocally portray the South and Confederates as the villains; perhaps at best misguided but nonetheless on the wrong side of history.

It is routine also to display almost all criminals—rapists, murderers, robbers—as whites, though the statistical truth, of course, is that violent crime in the United States is largely the work of non-whites. A few years ago, political scientist Robert Lichter showed in a study that while, during the last 30 years, whites were arrested for 40 percent of the murders committed in the United States, on television whites committed 90 percent of the murders.

Non-whites are frequently shown as not only heroic but also dominant over whites. It is a staple feature of police movies to portray blacks as the administrative superiors of the white protagonists, Mel Gibson's *Lethal Weapon* series being perhaps the best-known. The second installment in the series even depicted white South Africans—today's Hollywood version of Nazis, no doubt—as masterminding drug smuggling into the United States.

While the explicit racial hatred of whites expressed in black-directed films is well known, an increasingly common theme in mainstream television and film is that of the dangers represented by hordes of violent and vicious white supremacists, skinheads, neo-Nazis, paleo-Nazis, and racist terrorists who seem to lurk in every city, behind every storefront, in every small town throughout the country, everywhere, all the time. Recently, in the ABC-TV production of the eight-hour film of Stephen King's *The Stand*, a tale of the final struggle at the end of the world between supernatural forces of good and evil, the personification of

goodness and of God was an elderly black woman, while the devil was portrayed as a blue-eyed, blond-haired white man, whose evil followers waved the Confederate flag. Even at the end of the world, it seems, Hollywood cannot rid us of white racism.

Most of these examples, to be sure, are trivial enough. Euro-American civilization and the people who created it can survive the artistic contributions of Stephen King and Mel Gibson—maybe. But these examples are of interest precisely because they *are* so trivial and because for the most part they do *not* represent the main, explicit subject matter of popular culture today. In the 1960s, the film *Guess Who's Coming to Dinner* explicitly explored the subject of interracial marriage and brought it up for discussion, but today anti-white themes more typically provide the background and the context of popular entertainment. As such they either sneak into the public consciousness unexamined or in many cases are already there.

The erasure and displacement of official cultural symbols and the similar process in elite-produced, mass-consumed popular culture represents the expropriation of cultural norms, the standards by which public and private behavior is legitimized or condemned and a culture defined. While the traditional norms that are being attacked and discarded were almost never explicitly racial, the new norms that are being constructed and imposed are, and they are not only explicitly racial but also explicitly and vociferously anti-white.

This is a calculated tactic aimed at seizing cultural legitimacy and cultural hegemony and ultimately coercive political power on behalf of non-whites at the expense of whites. At the most extreme, the anti-white racialist movement resembles the ideology of German National Socialism. It offers a conspiratorial interpretation of history in which whites are systematically demonized as the enemies of the black race, and a myth of black racial solidarity and supremacy. "Afro-racism" is the ideological and political apparatus by which an explicit race war is prepared against the white race and its civilization, not as part of "rage" nor as a response to "injustice" and "neglect" but, like any war, as part of a concerted strategy to acquire power. It is not confined to blacks but extends also to other non-whites who care to sign up.

# Digging Our Own Grave

Of course non-whites are by no means the only peddlers of anti-white racism. One of the most remarkable features of our interesting times is the degree to which whites themselves help dig their own racial and civilizational grave. I have in my hand here a relatively new magazine to which I am sure you will all want to subscribe at once, entitled *Race Traitor: A Journal of the New Abolitionism*, published in Cambridge, Massachusetts, whose motto is, "Treason to Whiteness Is Loyalty to Humanity." The editors quote Julius Lester as writing, "White is not in the color of the skin. It is a condition of the mind, a condition that will be destroyed."

While *Race Traitor* does not seem to advocate physical genocide, it assumes that race is merely a social invention rather than a fact of nature and argues for the abolition of the concept of race as applied to whites. Racial identity is forbidden for whites but not for non-whites (or at least blacks). Of course the explicit goal is to destroy white civilization by doing away with the symbols and institutions of the collective consciousness that defines the race and is the foundation of the culture.

Yet the war against the white race and its civilization is not new. It is part of a world-historical movement that began in the late 19th century, perhaps not coincidentally, around the time of the battle of the Little Big Horn, and which the American racialist writer Lothrop Stoddard called, in the frank language of the 1920s, "The Rising Tide of Color Against White World Supremacy" and which Oswald Spengler a few years later called the "Coloured World Revolution."

It is easy to smile at such formulations today, but Martin Luther King himself explicitly and repeatedly linked the American civil rights movement with what, in a 1960 address entitled "The Rising Tide of Racial Consciousness," he called a "worldwide struggle." In his *Playboy* interview in 1965, King remarked, in a frank endorsement of racialist sentiment, that the American Negro "feels a deepening sense of identification with his black African brothers, and with his brown and yellow brothers of Asia, South America, and the Caribbean."

We recently witnessed just such a display of racial solidarity at the inauguration of Nelson Mandela in South Africa, when King's widow,

Coretta Scott King, arrived to stand by his side. Mrs. King, of course, does not travel thousands of miles to celebrate the victories of democracy in Eastern Europe, but only to countries where her racial comrades are being empowered.

It is true that Martin Luther King, Mrs. King, Mandela, and many other spokesmen for the "rising tide of [non-white] racial consciousness" espouse a liberal rhetoric that ostensibly promises racial equality rather than domination. But whether these spokesmen really believe in such a liberal vision or whether they merely wield it as a weapon against whites, there is little question that most blacks in the United States do not share liberal views about equality, freedom, and tolerance.

A recent Harris poll conducted for the National Conference released in March 1994 showed that non-white minorities (Hispanic as well as black) "are more likely than whites to apply harsh stereotypes to other minorities but are united in the view that whites are 'bigoted, bossy, and unwilling to share power,'" and the poll found that each minority believed it "is discriminated against by a white-controlled economy and educational system." Regardless of the liberalism espoused in public by many non-whites, these are hardly the attitudes from which a genuinely liberal policy can be expected to develop.

Some who support racial revolution may be sincere in invoking liberty, equality, and fraternity, but historical evidence suggests that it cannot be so. Historian William H. McNeill argues in a set of lectures delivered in 1985 at the University of Toronto that what he calls "ethnic hierarchy" is "on the rise, everywhere," and that it is indeed the normal condition of human civilizations. "Other civilized societies," writes McNeill, "have almost always accepted and enforced inequality among the diverse ethnic groups of which they were composed."

McNeill's term "ethnic hierarchy," of course, consists of words derived from Greek; if those words are loosely (but not too loosely) translated into their Latin equivalents, it is clear that McNeill is saying that racial domination, in one form or another, is the norm of human civilizations, that equality has little historical foundation, and that the illusion of such equality is about to be rudely dispelled.

The fraudulence of the liberalism espoused by the leaders of the racial revolution was clear to Spengler himself. "The hare," he wrote in his last book, *The Hour of Decision*, "may perhaps deceive the fox, but human

beings can *not* deceive each other. The coloured man sees through the white man when he talks about 'humanity' and everlasting peace. He scents the other's unfitness and lack of will to defend himself…. The coloured races are *not* pacifists. They do *not* cling to a life whose length is its sole value. *They take up the sword when we lay it down.* Once they feared the white man; now they despise him."

What is happening in our interesting times, then, to summarize briefly, is this. A concerted and long-term attack against the civilization of white, European and North American man has been launched, and the attack is not confined to the political, social, and cultural institutions that characterize the civilization but extends also to the race that created the civilization and continues to carry and transmit it today. The war against white civilization sometimes (indeed often) invokes liberal ideals as its justification and as its goal, but the likely reality is that the victory of the racial revolution will end merely in the domination or destruction of the white race and its civilization by the non-white peoples—if only for demographic reasons due to non-white immigration and the decline of white birth rates.

We know from the population projections by the U.S. Census Bureau last year that by the middle of the next century the present white majority of the United States will have dwindled to a minority in its own country, and given that fact and the increasing legitimization of anti-white racism in the United States, the situation in this country for whites is not going to get any better, to say the least.

Of course, the revolution could not have succeeded or gone as far as it has without the active assistance of whites. Some have supported the racial revolution against their own race and civilization and even larger numbers have acquiesced passively, their allegiance to their own people steadily subverted by the infusion of hidden assumptions hostile to them.

## Self-Generated Poisons

Stoddard and Spengler as well as the late James Burnham in his *Suicide of the West* analyzed these self-generated poisons by which the Western people prepare their own destruction. The ideological poison has assumed several different names: Marxism, liberalism, globalism, egalitarianism, and indeed much of the conservatism now espoused by people such as Jack

Kemp, Newt Gingrich, Bill Bennett, and William Buckley, as well as a good part of Christianity, especially in its "Social Gospel" forms. But behind all of these ideologies and slogans lies the pervasive venom of universalism, the vision of mankind with a capital *M*, which now often extends to include "animal rights" so as not to offend our brothers of field and stream.

In the universalist world-view, there is neither history nor race nor even species, neither specific cultures nor particular peoples nor meaningful boundaries. Therefore there are no concrete duties to race, nation, community, family, friend, or neighbor and indeed no distinctions to be drawn between neighbor and stranger, friend and foe, mine and thine, us and them.

In the happyland of universalism, we owe as much to the children of Somalia—indeed, more—than we do to the hapless citizens of Los Angeles, and Marines, who could not have been sent from Camp Pendleton to Los Angeles during the riots of 1992 and who are not ordered to prevent violation of the Mexican border adjacent to their own installation in southern California, are speedily dispatched to Somalia. Even to invoke "our" identity, our interests, our aspirations is to invite accusations of all the "isms" and "phobias" that are deployed to prevent further discussions and to paralyze the formation or the retention of a common consciousness that might at some point swell up into actual resistance to our dispossession. The principal white response to the incipient race war thus far, manifested in neo-conservative critiques of "Political Correctness" and multi-culturalism, is merely to regurgitate the formulas of universalism, to invoke the spirit of Martin Luther King, and to repeat the universalist ideals of equality, integration, and assimilation. The characteristic defense of Western civilization by most conservatives today is merely a variation of the liberal universalism that the enemies of the West and whites also invoke. It is to argue that non-whites and non-Westerners ought to value modern Western civilization as in their own best interests. It is to emphasize the liberal "progress" of the modern West through the abolition of slavery, the emancipation of non-whites, the retreat from imperialism, the achievement of higher living standards and political equality, et cetera.

Of course, if the liberalism espoused by non-whites is a thin veil for the assertion of their own racial solidarity against whites, then all such argumentation is vain. It accomplishes nothing to preach liberalism to those

who despise liberalism along with everything else derived from the white West. The uselessness of doing so was pointed out by the 19th-century French rightist Louis Veuillot in his ironic comment, "When I am the weaker, I ask you for my freedom, because that is your principle; but when I am the stronger, I take away your freedom, because that is my principle." Or, as Neitzsche put a similar thought even more succinctly, "The values of the weak prevail because the strong have taken them over as devices of leadership."

Instead of invoking a suicidal liberalism and regurgitating the very universalism that has subverted our identity and our sense of solidarity, what we as whites must do is reassert our identity and our solidarity, and we must do so in explicitly racial terms through the articulation of a racial consciousness as whites. The reassertion of our solidarity must be expressed in racial terms for two major reasons. In the first place, the attack upon us defines itself in racial terms and seeks through the delegitimization of race for whites and the legitimization of race for non-whites the dispersion and destruction of the foundations of our solidarity, while at the same time consolidating non-white cohesiveness against whites.

Historian Isaiah Berlin noted in 1991 that "nationalism and racism are the most powerful movements in the world today," and at a time when the self-declared enemies of the white race define themselves in racial terms, only our own definition of ourselves in those terms can meet their challenge. If and when that challenge should triumph and those enemies come to kill us, as the Tutsi people have been slaughtered in Rwanda, they will do so not because we are "Westerners" or "Americans" or "Christians" or "conservatives" or "liberals" but because we are white.

Secondly, we need to assert a specifically racial identity because race is real—biological forces, including those that determine race, are important for social, cultural, and historical events. I do not suggest that race as a biological reality is by itself *sufficient* to explain the civilization of European man—if race were sufficient, there would be no problem—but race is *necessary* for it, and it is likely that biological science in the near future will show even more clearly how necessary racial, biological, and genetic explanations are to understanding social and historical events more fully.

The civilization that we as whites created in Europe and America could not have developed apart from the genetic endowments of the creating

people, nor is there any reason to believe that the civilization can be successfully transmitted to a different people. If the people or race who created and sustained the civilization of the West should die, then the civilization also will die. A merely cultural consciousness, then, that emphasizes only social and cultural factors as the roots of our civilization is not enough, because a merely cultural consciousness will not by itself conserve the race and people that were necessary for the creation of the culture and who remain necessary for its survival. We need not only to understand the role of race in creating our civilization but also to incorporate that understanding in our defense of our civilization. Until we do so, we can expect only to keep on losing the war we are in.

# Unwitting Identification

The fundamental problem of the American white population was unwittingly identified by *Newsweek* in its March 29, 1993, cover story, "White Male Paranoia." In an effort to puncture any tendencies among white men to think of themselves as victims, endangered, or exploited, *Newsweek* pointed out, "White males make up just 39.2 percent of the population, yet they account for 82.5 percent of the *Forbes* 400 (folks worth at least $265 million), 77 percent of Congress, 92 percent of daily-newspaper editors, 77 percent of TV news directors." From this avalanche of numbers, *Newsweek* infers that it's "still a statistical piece of cake being a white man, at least in comparison with being anything else." *Newsweek* may be right in its numbers, but the numbers miss the point.

What the numbers tell us is that whites do not act cohesively or think of themselves as a unit, that whites have no racial consciousness; if they did, they would be using their persisting political, economic, and cultural power in their own interests, and the very perceptible "white male paranoia" that *Newsweek* was talking about—the very real sense of an incipient slippage from a position of control—would not exist.

In the United States today, whites exist objectively but do not exist subjectively, and that is in my view the fundamental racial problem they face, the basic reason they (I should say "we") are losing the racial war against us, the very reason we are in a war at all. *Newsweek*'s numbers offer proof of the objective existence of whites and of white power as measured

materially and quantitatively; the spineless abnegation of their own country and culture that is at the root of white male paranoia offers proof of the absence of a subjective existence. Whites do not exist subjectively because they do not think of themselves as whites, they do not act cohesively as whites, and they do not think being white is important or even meaningful.

As long as whites continue to avoid and deny their own racial identity, at a time when almost every other racial and ethnic category is rediscovering and asserting its own, whites will have no chance to resist their dispossession and their eventual possible physical destruction. Before we can seriously discuss any concrete proposals for preserving our culture and its biological and demographic foundations, we have to address and correct the problem we inflict on ourselves, our own lack of a racial consciousness and the absence of a common will to act in accordance with it.

What Benjamin Franklin told his colleagues at the birth of the American Republic remains true today as the Republic, and the race and civilization that gave birth to the Republic, approach their death: If we do not hang together—not only as members of a common nation but also as part of a common race, a common people—then most assuredly we will all hang separately.

*This article originally appeared in the September 1994 issue of* American Renaissance.

* * *

* * *

# Prospects for Racial and Cultural Survival

## Separation, as proposed in the previous issue, would not work, and there is a better solution.

*Two articles in the February 1995 issue of* American Renaissance *recommended the physical separation of American whites from people of other races. Rabbi Mayer Schiller described the changes we can expect as our population becomes increasingly non-white, and concluded that European civilization can be preserved on this continent only if whites withdraw into an enclave. He conceded that territorial division was not likely in the near term but argued that no other solution could guarantee the survival of a distinctly Western society and culture.*

*Richard McCulloch added support for separation, noting that multi-racial societies always result in miscegenation. He pointed out that most white traits are recessive, and that unless there is physical separation, racial mixture and high non-white birthrates will eventually destroy whites as a physically distinct group.*

*Sam Francis replied in the next issue of* American Renaissance, *in what is perhaps his most forceful exposition of the practical steps whites must take if the United States is to remain part of the West.*

*

It is all very well to say, as Mr. McCulloch and Rabbi Schiller do in the February issue of *American Renaissance*, that racial separation is necessary for the survival of whites and the civilization whites have created. It is quite different to spell out exactly how separation could come about and be successful. Neither they nor most other advocates of separatism seem to offer much in the way of concrete proposals, perhaps in part because they know that racial separation involves problems that today are virtually

insurmountable, and that until those problems are solved neither separation nor any other enduring solution to the racial crisis is possible.

I do not question the arguments for the desirability of separation that Rabbi Schiller and Mr. McCulloch have mounted. Even if the survival of whites as a people and a civilization were not threatened, I am willing to grant at least a pragmatic right of every self-conscious people to govern itself and to create and live within its own institutions—a right that liberal ideals of assimilation refuse to recognize despite their deference to the Declaration of Independence. Nevertheless, I do question whether separation as Rabbi Schiller and Mr. McCulloch have described it can come about or even whether it should come about. Racial separation means the relocation of the different races (let us limit the discussion here to the two main races in America, whites and blacks) either to areas of the country that would become politically independent and self-governing or to other countries.

It can therefore take place in only two different ways: (1) as Rabbi Schiller seems to propose, through the establishment of "racially based nations within the territory of the United States," "dividing the nation into racial zones"—in a word, the political breakup of the United States; or (2) through relocation of one race by its removal (voluntary or not) to some other territory outside the present United States. In either case, there are three problems: (a) Where is each or either race actually going to go; (b) How is separation going to be implemented; and (c) How are the separated races going to be induced to stay where they are once they get there?

If racial separatism is to be a serious movement and not just one more escape hatch for whites who refuse to deal with political and social reality, these questions will have to be answered. Avoiding answering them with responses such as "It's too early to tell how it's going to happen," suggests that separatism is just another fantasy for whites who refuse to face the threats to their survival.

# Patriotic Loyalties

Rabbi Schiller's proposal for breaking up the United States is one that whites ought not to embrace readily and at the present time will not embrace, since it involves surrendering large parts of their own country to

non-whites. Most white Americans retain too much sense of nationality and too much allegiance to their country and their own communities to accept the proposal of giving up large parts of the United States to others (racially different or not). For defenders of the white race and its heritage to adopt this strategy at this point would simply increase their problems because it would place them in antagonism to the patriotic and nationalist loyalties of most of their fellow whites and would allow their enemies to brand them as literally "un-American."

By embracing a strategy that involved breaking up the United States, not only would whites be abandoning their own country but also they would be forced to give up appeals to its history, its traditions, and its interests as a nation. We could no longer cite the words of Jefferson and Lincoln (and other American statesmen) on racial matters; we could no longer invoke the U.S. Constitution as an authority; we could no longer argue that immigration threatens our national interests because there would be no nation to have interests; we could no longer mention the settlement and conquest of North America by whites, if only because we would have confessed that that settlement and conquest have been failures from which we were now running as fast as we could. By consenting to national disintegration and separatism, in short, we would have to start all over in the project of constructing a culture, a country, and a political order. If only for practical reasons, it is much easier to stay with those we already have than it is to invent new ones that do not exist save in the mind's eye.

Moreover, whites should not embrace this proposal because at the present time and for a long time to come, there is no need to. There may well come a time when partition is the only recourse left to whites, but that time is far off. The fact is that descendants of Europeans are still a large majority of the American population and still retain far more wealth, political power, and even cultural dominance than non-whites. *If whites wanted to do so*, they could dictate a solution to the racial problem tomorrow—by curtailing immigration and sealing the border, by imposing adequate fertility controls on non-whites and encouraging a higher white birth rate, by refusing to be bullied into enduring "multi-culturalism," affirmative action, civil rights laws and policies; and by refusing to submit to cultural dissolution, inter-racial violence and insults, and the guilt that multi-racialists inculcate.

Ending all of these threats to the white European character of the United States would involve no vast constitutional or political changes, but it would involve an uncompromising assertion of white will and identity. The fundamental problem with whites today will not be solved by giving away any more of what remains of their country and their heritage but by asserting their own will and identity in order to retain the primacy of their heritage in their own country. It is that lack of will and identity, that lack of racial and cultural consciousness, that must be remedied before we resort to any dissolution of the country (or indeed any other resolution of the racial crisis).

If national breakup is a plan that we neither can nor should accept, there remains the other kind of racial separatism in the form of the relocation of one race by its removal to some other territory outside the United States. Rabbi Schiller considers this contingency in his suggestion (and subsequent rejection) of white removal to Europe. He rejects this proposal, rightly, in reflecting that Europe would not particularly want another 100 million residents. While that is a powerful reason for rejecting the suggestion, there is another that is at least as compelling: However much they may deplore their accelerating dispossession, most whites might not want to jump ship from the nation they created, and live in countries where they have no roots.

Yet, if emigration to Europe is not practical for whites, emigration to Africa or other black majority regions is not practical for American blacks either. It is highly unlikely that very many black African countries would welcome large numbers of American black émigrés and even more unlikely that very many American blacks would want to go. “Back to Africa” may have been feasible in the days of the American Colonization Society, when Africa was a diplomatic toy of European and American imperialism, but today, with independent and sovereign (however dilapidated and repressive) nation-states in Africa, mass migration there is not possible unless the African states were simply forced to accept it. Moreover, in the unlikely event that foreign nations were willing to receive large numbers of black American immigrants, none (except perhaps for other white majority nations) has the infrastructural capacity to assimilate them.

# Maintaining Separation

Yet even if physical relocation (within or without the United States) were to occur, and even if it were voluntary on all sides, there remains the problem, which is hardly ever considered, of how the separated races would be induced to remain separate. Let us assume that Rabbi Schiller's proposal has been implemented, that black and white "racial zones" have been established, and that democratically chosen representatives of both races have accepted such a partition. The brute fact is that there will still remain immense pressures for the breakdown of this separation—for the same reasons that the United States today finds itself practically unable to control its own borders. (These reasons, as I shall argue presently, are deeply rooted in the white race.)

Whites will want cheap labor, and many non-whites will want to supply it. If the black zone in any way resembles most of the black majority nation-states or American cities today (detailed accounts of which *American Renaissance* never fails to provide us), it will be unable to support itself, to control crime and social disorder, to supply elementary administrative services, or even to avoid the most brutal political repression. This kind of breakdown would undoubtedly generate both humanitarian and imperialistic designs in the white zone (as in Africa in the 19th century or Somalia and Rwanda today), but even if those designs were resisted, there would be other anti-separatist pressures in the white zones too.

Just as there would be immense pull pressure from the white zone for cheap labor, so there would be immense push pressure from within the black zone for emigration to the white zone. As the white demand for labor generated political and ideological forces favoring some immigration (you would see the replication of all the Jack Kemp-Julian Simon arguments that we now enjoy), the separation would gradually (perhaps quickly) dissolve. The fact is that the non-white world almost invariably beats a path to the white door, and the whites behind the door almost invariably open it. This is why there is immigration into this country and Europe today. This is why, at the height of apartheid in South Africa, there were some 100,000 illegal black immigrants every year. Because whites are almost always more economically successful than non-whites, non-whites almost always want to come in, and because the whites (aside from generosity and ideology) often seek cheap labor, they often let them come or even subsidize their coming. This, after all, is why there was an African slave trade.

The only possible solution to these problems, one that has always been possible but has never worked for very long, is simply for the white zones to maintain such a solidified and univocal racial consciousness that no non-whites are allowed to enter. But, unless we are able to rewrite the history of white civilization for these new white zones, casually omitting any legacies from liberalism, socialism, capitalism, or Christianity, it is almost inconceivable how that kind of racial solidarity could even come into existence.

The problems of separation are compounded by the geographical features of the North American continent: its lack of natural barriers that would serve as boundaries for autonomous political units or as obstacles to population movements, military invasions, economic integration, political and cultural absorption, et cetera. Europe, after all, has mountain ranges like the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Carpathians, a system of rivers, and various peninsulas that permitted the creation of geographically distinct nation-states. North America has nothing like these geographical features that would facilitate politico-racial separation.

But perhaps I exaggerate the willingness with which whites would compromise the founding principle of their separate entity. Assuming that a separate zone or state were established, would its existence not presuppose that its residents were sufficiently committed to white racial identity that they would not be tempted by the prospect of cheap labor or by the ideological pathologies that afflict us today? It is of course possible that such a racially solidified state could evolve, but on historical grounds it is highly unlikely.

White racial separatism presumably would center on race, pure and simple, as the basis of separation, and in all the history of the white race and its various civilizations there is no precedent for that degree of racial consciousness. Even the Confederacy did not make such a purely racial appeal but combined it (usually incoherently) with regional, cultural, economic, and political aspirations. Probably many Southerners did not seriously want to secede, or expect to remain out of the union for long, and virtually none of them thought of their new state as a racially pure nation. One of the few white Southerners who did advocate something like a racial nationalism, Hinton Rowan Helper, was forced to flee the South and take refuge in the North.

Nor indeed did the National Socialists, perhaps the most extreme racialists in history, rely on race to the degree to which a white separatist movement would. The National Socialists came to power only in part because of their racialist ideology; they also appealed to economic fears, anti-communism, and German nationalism. Only later did the Nazi government move more and more explicitly toward a purely racial doctrine as the basis of the state, and few Germans were ever committed to that doctrine.

## A Thin Reed

The reason for the lack of any precedent for a purely racial foundation of a white state, society, or culture ought to be clear. An appeal only to race selects the thinnest possible reed on which to base a movement. Race, as it is understood today in scientific terms, is largely an abstraction, and while it serves to explain much about society, history, and human behavior, it remains too much of an abstraction to generate much loyalty or motivate much action. The skeleton of race acquires concrete meaning and generates concrete loyalties only as it takes on cultural and political flesh, as race becomes tied up with community, kinship, nationality, territory, language, literature, art, religion, moral codes and manners, social class, and political aspirations. It is precisely such accretions that convert the biological abstraction of "race" into the concrete category of a "people."

I agree with Rabbi Schiller (and for that matter with Father Ronald Tacelli in an earlier issue of *American Renaissance*) when he writes that "so much of our civilization's crisis goes beyond race." While race is necessary for an explanation of the civilization of European man, it is not sufficient. If race were sufficient, there would be no problem. If racial (biological, genetic) factors were sufficient to sustain a people, it would never experience a decline as long as its racial integrity endured.

Thus, whites did not descend to their present pitiable condition because their racial purity was somehow diluted but because they conceptually surrendered their will and identity—which they did well before they began to surrender their heritage politically and materially. If race were sufficient, that conceptual surrender would never have taken place. The conceptual surrender is leading to a situation where the biological survival of the race

is threatened, and if that occurs, then—because race is necessary, because no other race or people seems able to replicate or adopt the concepts on which white civilization is based—the conceptual surrender will not be remedied, and white civilization, the whole conceptual corpus, will die with the race.

Moreover, with all due respect to any innate sense of racial solidarity, we all know that that sense among most whites today is largely nonexistent. Even if it developed significantly in the near future (and it does seem to be developing), there are a great many other factors to be taken into consideration in setting up a separate political order for whites.

To name only the obvious, would John Kenneth Galbraith, Bill Clinton, Earl Warren (were he still alive), George Bush, Bill Buckley, et cetera, be admitted into the white separatist enclave? All of them are undoubtedly white, but if you did admit people like these, you would soon have all the problems that made you want to separate in the first place. There would be other debates: How about Eastern and Southern Europeans? The Irish? How about Jews? Could Yankees come into a Southern white separatist state? If there were several white racial states, would one or some ally with non-white states against the white states? My point in bringing up all these questions is that it is idle to talk about racial separatism without (a) a widely shared and well-defined concept of race to which virtually all whites would rigorously adhere and (b) equally widely shared and well-defined concepts of other criteria in addition to race that would prevent replication of the same errors and flaws that caused the problems in the first place.

The conclusion to which we are forced is that race by itself—and therefore a state or zone constituted on a purely racial basis—is not sufficient either to sustain the kind of society most *American Renaissance* readers would want or to prevent the perpetuation of the poisons that have helped weaken and now threaten the survival of both white civilization and the white race. Racial separatism is therefore not a solution to the crisis the white race encounters. There must also be other, non-racial, cultural and political remedies in addition to an awakened racial consciousness. I have to say also that Mr. McCulloch's argument for separatism does not persuade me either. No more than Rabbi Schiller does he offer any concrete considerations about actually implementing a separation or how to make the separation work. But there is also a larger problem with his point of view. Mr. McCulloch argues, by analogy with what ecologists and sociobiologists

have discovered about animal populations, that unless races, subspecies, or populations are reproductively isolated, intermixture and therefore racial extinction is inevitable.

I do not doubt the truth of this claim, but the point is that it is true on an evolutionary time-scale. When we are talking about whether human societies should be monoracial or not, we are dealing with a human, historical time-scale, and the evolutionary scale is largely irrelevant to the limited endurance of historical human societies. North America has in fact been a multi-racial region for some 300 years now, a significant period of time in human history (about 10 percent of the known history of the European peoples) but insignificant in biological time. Despite a good deal of racial mixture in 300 years, there is no prospect of the extinction of either the black or white races on this continent because of mixture. The threat of white extinction is due to non-white immigration and high fertility coupled with low white fertility.

Moreover, I think Mr. McCulloch comes close to contradicting himself when he writes, on the one hand, that reproductive isolation "requires geographic separation" and on the other hand that "tremendous advances in transportation … have reduced the main obstacles to separation." If transportation is so easy these days (as it is), how can geographic separation persist? My own view is that the advances in transportation technology tend to render geographical isolation almost impossible, and certainly they have immensely facilitated immigration into Europe and North America.

## Separatism Versus Supremacy

But there is also a deeper problem with the strategy of white racial separatism. I have the impression that at least some of its advocates support it because they think the alternative of white supremacy is simply unacceptable, that white separatism as opposed to supremacy sounds nicer, less threatening, less dominative, and may be more palatable to liberal orthodoxy. Moreover, I suspect that many who regard themselves as white separatists are unwilling or unable to assert a moral foundation for white supremacy and that in this respect they share, however unconsciously, the liberal and egalitarian abhorrence of any assertion of power, dominance, or hierarchy. Some (perhaps most) white separatists renounce white racial

supremacy because they genuinely have ethical problems with one race's ruling another.

In this respect, white separatism is somewhat analogous to neo-conservatism, which also seeks to avoid invoking more radically anti-liberal ideas and values in order to make itself acceptable to the dominant liberalism. The flaw of both separatism and neo-conservatism in these respects is that they do nothing to challenge liberal premises but try to work within the framework established by liberalism. Hence, neo-conservatives are continually being dragged to the left by the implications of their own hidden premises. I expect something similar would happen to white separatists, especially as they tried to make alliances with non-white separatists. I already see tendencies toward this, specifically, an unwillingness to assert unequivocally that since the United States is a white creation, whites should not willingly accept its political destruction through separatism.

To put this problem of white separatism more bluntly, the history of the white race is one of conquest and domination of non-whites. This has been true since the prehistoric Indo-European invasions of Europe and the Near East. The tragedy of this history of conquest is that there have almost never been enough whites to avoid being absorbed by the conquered peoples, either racially or culturally. Only when whites have wiped out those they conquered or when the conquered non-whites were a small population did absorption by indigenous non-whites fail to occur. Even the Romans were eventually overcome by Asiatic populations.

One reason for this pattern of the conquered giving laws to the conquerors is, as I noted with respect to the probable breakdown of a white racial state, that whites need (or at least want) the conquered peoples—as slaves, cheap labor, concubines, et cetera. Hence, even the most racially conscious white states (the early American Republic, the Confederacy, South Africa) used or planned to use the labor of subjugated races, and eventually (if the regimes lasted long enough), those races overcame their masters, at least indirectly.

My point is that this urge to expand and conquer seems to be biologically rooted in whites, manifesting itself also in Spengler's Faustian spirit of the West: science, architecture, mathematics, et cetera. The passivity and timidity of today's whites are clearly temporary though suicidal aberrations, due to historical causes; not to consider them so is to

deny one of the central characteristics of a people. White separatism, as some of its exponents describe it, because it would involve the deliberate dissolution of a white-created political and cultural order, appears to be radically at odds with this innate dynamism of the white race. Therefore, the concept of a separate white state composed of the fragments of a disintegrated and surrendered United States would not work and ought to be deeply repugnant to what I take to be an instinctual white proclivity.

My bet is that no sooner should a white separatist state establish itself than it would begin to import non-whites for labor and other forms of exploitation, and the whole history would begin to repeat itself. Moreover, my bet is that non-whites would eagerly lend themselves to this, as they have in the past, since the standard of living and political conditions in the white areas would be so much more attractive than in the non-white areas.

Racial separatism, then, does not impress me as a realistic strategy for the survival, let alone the flourishing, of the white race and any civilization it would be likely to build, at least at the present time. To summarize, it fails to identify any physical area for the relocation of either race; it fails to anticipate the likely pressures for recombination of the races; it relies almost entirely on a supposititious white racial consciousness that has no historical precedent and would be inadequate by itself, even if it existed, to sustain a real society, culture, or government; and it involves the deliberate surrender of part of a territory, political order, and civilization that were created by whites and remain theirs. Until the advocates of separatism can provide answers for these objections, I cannot see that what they advocate is anything more than a desperate and fantastic effort to avoid grappling with the real roots of our racial and cultural decline.

Nevertheless, though I am not convinced by their arguments, white separatists are correct that we do face what is probably the most serious and threatening crisis in our racial history, a crisis that, if it is not resolved in our favor, will almost certainly result in the loss of white control of the United States within half a century, in the disappearance of white civilization, and eventually in biological extinction. If white separatism is not the answer, what is?

# Reconquest

The answer is, quite simply, the reconquest of the United States. This reconquest does not involve any restoration of white supremacy in the political and legal sense that obtained under slavery or segregation, and there is no reason why non-whites who reside in the United States could not enjoy equality of legal rights. But a white reconquest of the United States would mean the supremacy of whites in a cultural sense, or in the sense of what is nowadays called "Eurocentrism." There are essentially three things that whites must do in order to carry out this reconquest of the nation and culture they have almost lost:

(1) Whites must formulate a white racial consciousness that identifies racial and biological endowments as important and relevant to social behavior, and their own racial endowments as essential to the continuing existence of Euro-American civilization. The formation of a white racial consciousness does not mean that whites should think of themselves only as whites, to the exclusion of ethnic, national, religious, regional, class, or other identities, or that individuality should yield to the collective category of race. It means merely that we recognize racial realities, that we recognize that racial-biological endowments are necessary to certain kinds of human behavior (e.g., the political and civic behavior appropriate to stable self-government, the work habits and lifestyles appropriate to a dynamic economy; the intellectual behavior that is necessary for science and scholarship, et cetera) and that because these endowments are largely unique to whites, the behavior they make possible cannot be replicated by most non-whites.

Nor does the formation of white racial consciousness mean that we should conceive of ourselves only as biological beings to the exclusion of religious or metaphysical identities. Racial consciousness means that we add recognition of biological and racial factors to our traditional concepts of human nature and modify both our biological and non-biological conceptions of what man is, as evidence and reason dictate. It may be true that some traditional religious and metaphysical conceptions would not survive recognition of the scientific realities of race, just as some did not survive earlier scientific discoveries in astronomy, geology, and biology.

But the formation of white racial consciousness does mean that whites would recognize themselves as a race and their racially based behavior as legitimate, and hence it would mean the end of tolerance for non-white assaults on white people and the norms of white civilization. Whites would

simply no longer countenance non-white aggression and insults or the idolization of non-white heroes, icons, and culture; white children would be raised in accordance with what is proper to being white, and norms openly recognized as appropriate to whites would be the legitimizing and dominant norms of American society as they were prior to the 1960s. Racial guilt and truckling would end.

(2) On the basis of this racial consciousness, whites must counter the demographic threat they face from immigration and non-white fertility and whites' own infertility. This means (a) an absolute halt to all future legal immigration into the United States, deployment of the armed forces on the appropriate borders to cut off illegal immigration, and deportation of all illegal immigrants (and perhaps many recent legal immigrants); (b) the end of subsidies for the non-white birth rate through welfare programs, obligatory use of contraception by welfare recipients, and encouragement of its use among non-whites, and (c) encouragement of increases in white fertility.

(3) Whites must correct the political and legal order to end the political power of non-white minorities and their white anti-white allies. This political effort would involve a radical dismantling of all affirmative action and civil rights legislation as well as a good part of the federal governmental superstructure that entrenches minority power. It also would require recovering an understanding of constitutional law that permits local and state governments to govern and private institutions to function independently of government.

Under such an understanding, whites and non-whites would enjoy equality of legal rights in the sense of those fundamental rights listed in the very first Civil Rights Act of 1866: "the inhabitants of every race … shall have the same right to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of persons and property, and shall be subject to like punishment … and no others."

But, as the Northern enemies of slavery who drafted and enacted this language recognized, equality of legal rights, equality before the law, does not mean political equality, the right to vote, or the right to hold political office, let alone social and economic equality, nor the "right" to attend the same schools, to serve on juries, to marry across racial lines, to serve in the

armed forces, to eat at lunch counters, to ride on buses, to buy a house or rent a room or hold a job, to receive welfare, to be admitted to colleges and universities, to take academic degrees or to be promoted.

All these are phony "rights" that have been fabricated through the corruption of our constitutional law and our understanding of it, and no citizen of any race is entitled to them. Under a proper understanding of constitutional law, states and localities could differ as to whether they recognized such "rights" or not, but the federal government would not, and the only legal rights that either the United States or state governments would be required to recognize and enforce equally would be those Blackstonean rights of personal security, personal liberty, and property mentioned above. Those citizens of either race who found these rights insufficient for the satisfaction of their ambitions would be free to depart. (For an exposition of the constitutional history and theory of this conception of rights, see Raoul Berger, *Government by Judiciary: The Transformation of the Fourteenth Amendment*, Harvard University Press, 1977.)

In order to achieve these goals and the reconquest of the United States they involve, there must be an immense amount of cultural and intellectual reconquest beforehand, a long march through the dominant institutions and apparatus of power by which the incumbent elites exercise control over the state, the economy, and the culture of the United States. I have outlined the theoretical framework of such a long march elsewhere (see "Winning the Culture War: The American Cause," *Chronicles*, December 1993). Recent political developments encourage me to believe that such a movement remains possible and is indeed beginning, though the danger is that it will be captured and betrayed by agents of the incumbent elite.

However great that danger may be and however remote the chances of victory today may seem, it remains a strategy that is far more likely to succeed than the strategy of surrender that racial separatism involves. What white Americans must do is get on with ensuring that it does succeed before they lose their country, their heritage, and their posterity forever.

*This article originally appeared in the March 1995 issue of* American Renaissance.

* * *

* * *

# The Roots of the White Man

## The origins of our racial characteristics lie in the distant past.

### by Edwin Clark

*In the fall of 1996 I wrote a two-part article in which I tried to analyze the racially self-destructive character of our times in terms of the deep racial traits of whites. I argued that the unwillingness of today's whites to defend themselves as a race and their insistence that people of all races should be recognized as having equal claim to our traditional homelands are modern perversions of a characteristic Western trait: a commitment to fairness.*

*I wrote that this trait is the basis for distinctive institutions and traditions that originated in the West. Some of these are democratic government, respect for women, freedom of speech, the rule of law, and even the modern concern for animals and the environment. These are all expressions of a fundamentally reciprocal view of human (and even non-human) relations, and give priority to considerations of fairness over the exercise of pure power. I argued that fairness is the common thread that runs through many practices we take for granted but that some people of other races have been slow to adopt.*

*It was in the West that societies grew up in which it was assumed that the same law applied both to the rich and the poor, that the vote of a powerful man counted no more than that of his servant, that women had rights men must respect, and that animals deserve protection from cruelty and neglect. I wrote that these values reflect a deep-seated desire among whites that their societies be organized in ways that fairly reflect the requirements of all members. I argued that multi-racialism and racial egalitarianism are recent and questionable extensions to non-whites of this ancient sense of fairness, and that because non-whites do not always share*

*this basic value, we run great risks by welcoming them into our societies in large numbers and subjecting ourselves to their eventual dominance.*

*Francis used the pseudonym Edwin Clark for this article, but I do not think he attached any particular significance to that name. He used a pseudonym because this article ranges across very broad areas of learning and he may not have wanted to be held strictly to account for its contents. Likewise, in what is the most academic of the articles in this collection, he took the unusual step of footnoting his references.*

*

Jared Taylor's two-part essay on the character of the white race offers many perceptive and even brilliant insights into the qualities that distinguish whites from other peoples. Nevertheless, reading his essay, it seemed to me that someone not familiar with *American Renaissance* would come away from it thinking that whites are simply natural liberals, genetically disposed to support or exhibit "freedom of speech, rule of law, sportsmanship, republican government, high regard for women, concern for animals, and the environment."

One problem with Mr. Taylor's catalogue of white racial traits is that they strike me as being largely modern, and while they may indeed be characteristic of whites, I believe they derive from deeper traits that the white race has exhibited throughout its history and in almost all the cultures it has developed. In modern times, these characteristics have often become exaggerated or contorted far beyond their original meaning and functions, so that today these same racial characteristics often contribute significantly to the weakness and decline that now threaten to destroy the white race and its civilization.

My purpose in writing this response to Mr. Taylor's article is not to fault him but rather to try to move the discussion to a higher or at least a different and less localized plane. By looking at the deep racial-cultural history of whites since ancient times, we discover more profoundly who we are, where we come from, and where we may be going. We may also learn how to control those traits that are now contributing to our destruction and to make use of them and other, more fundamental ones that can help place us back on the path toward what should be our racial destiny.

When speaking of "whites," I mean the branch of the Caucasian race now generally called "Indo-Europeans," or what used to be known as "Aryans," whose descendants today constitute the main part of the populations of Europe, North America, Australia, and New Zealand. The term "Aryan" has, for obvious reasons, gone out of fashion, but prior to the rise of German National Socialism, it was a widely accepted anthropological label, and the great archaeologist V. Gordon Childe wrote a book entitled *The Aryans* (1926), which remains a useful survey of what was then known of the origins and early history of the ancestors of European Man.

Whether we employ the term "Aryan" or "Indo-European," however, most anthropologists today use these terms merely as linguistic or at most cultural labels and insist that they do not refer to race. Yet this usage seems artificial. The early Indo-Europeans, no matter where they lived or where their remains have been found, were white, and their physical remains, art, and languages reflect their essential racial unity, regardless of the diversity of the subracial stocks into which they eventually divided in various parts of the world and the mixtures with other stocks and races that eventually absorbed many of them.

The Indo-Europeans are thought to have originated in the steppes of Russia and began to move out of that area into what is now eastern and northern Europe, the Near East, and India in the third or second millennium B.C. The earliest known written Indo-European language is the Linear B script of the Greek city-state of Mycenae around 1500 B.C., and it was around this time also that the Aryans invaded India and displaced the dying Dravidian civilizations of the Indus Valley.

In Europe, the Aryan invaders conquered and displaced the non-Indo-European peoples of the archaic megalithic civilization that built Stonehenge and similar colossal monuments. In the Near East and India, the Indo-Europeans conquered many peoples who had created literate, urban civilizations. In some cases, the Aryans were, to a greater or lesser degree, absorbed into the larger populations they had conquered.

Of particular interest to us are the common features of archaic Indo-European peoples, which continue to shape modern Indo-European-derived beliefs and institutions. As the French folklorist Georges Dumézil has pointed out, one of the principal characteristics of early Indo-European societies is a hierarchical, three-tiered or "tripartite" class structure of

priests, warriors, and herder-cultivators. This structure appears to be racially rooted and prefigures many of the societal characteristics we now think of as typically Western or European.

The Indo-Europeanist J.P. Mallory has pointed out one of the central elements of this Indo-European three-class society:

> One of the more obvious symbols of social tripartition is colour, emphasized by the fact that both ancient India and Iran expressed the concept of caste with the word for colour (*varna*). A survey of the social significance of different colours is fairly clear cut, at least for the first two functions. Indo-Iranian, Hittite, Celtic and Latin ritual all assign white to priests and red to the warrior. The third would appear to have been marked by a darker colour such as black or blue.[1]

The racial symbolism of such caste colors is obvious, with the higher ranks of society being symbolized by the color associated with the lighter-skinned Aryans and the lower ranks symbolized by the darker hues of the conquered non-Aryan races.

Indeed, racial consciousness among the early Aryans was commonplace. Romila Thapar, a modern Indian scholar, writes, "The first step in the direction of caste (as distinct from class) was taken when the Aryans treated the Dasas [non-Aryans] as beyond the social pale, probably owing to a fear of the Dasas and the even greater fear that assimilation with them would lead to a loss of Aryan identity. Ostensibly the distinction was largely that of colour, the Dasas being darker and of an alien culture…. The colour-element of caste was emphasized, throughout this period, and was eventually to become deep-rooted in north-Indian Aryan culture. Initially, therefore, the division was between the Aryans and the non-Aryans."[2]

*The Laws of Manu*, the ancient Sanskrit code of social obligations for Hinduism, is very explicit about the consequences of interracial marriage:

> An unknown man, of no (visible) class but born of a defiled womb and no Aryan, may seem to have the form of an Aryan, but he can be discovered by his own innate activities. Un-Aryan behaviour, harshness, cruelty, and habitual failure to perform the rituals are the manifestations in this world indicating that a man is born of a defiled womb…. But the

kingdom in which these degraded bastards are born, defiling the classes, quickly perishes, together with the people who live there.[3]

Whatever modern scholars may say about the old Aryans being merely a language group and not a race, that does not seem to be the way the old Aryans themselves looked upon the question.

Dumézil's "tripartition thesis" shows that the archaic Indo-Europeans throughout the world possessed a remarkably similar social structure and common culture extending well beyond language and including the ordering of society and religion. One of Dumézil's leading students, C. Scott Littleton, points out a crucial way in which Indo-European societies differed from those of non-Indo-Europeans. "The food-producing class, while distinct from that of the warriors, was nevertheless a much more integral part of the total society…. The ancient I-E [Indo-European] herdsmen and cultivators—and perhaps the artisans as well—would seem to have played a part in the total ritual and social life of their communities undreamed of by the ancestors of the Egyptian fellahin and their counterparts in Mesopotamia."[4]

The subordinate but distinct social and political role for the "third class" ensured a level of participation in the community unknown to the wholly dominated peasants of the Asiatic non-Aryan peoples. This may help account for the eventual appearance of participatory and representative (republican and democratic) political systems among the Aryan peoples.

Moreover, the separation of the military and religious functions into distinct classes points to an early Indo-European tendency toward a distinction between the sacred and the secular that seems to be entirely unique to the Indo-European peoples and which may be the foundation of the later differentiation of science and philosophy from religion in European society, as well as the source of the conflict between secular and ecclesiastical authority in European history.

Finally, this ordering of society and social function was conceived as having supernatural or cosmic sanction and was held to be in accord with the order of nature. Some scholars believe that the tripartite structure of Indo-European society survived into medieval Europe with the division of society into "those who work, those who fight, and those who pray," and it may also be reflected in the division of political functions into executive,

judicial, and legislative in the U.S. Constitution, and even in the Christian idea of the Trinity.

It is possible to extract from the mythology of the Aryans and from the remains of their cultures and literature certain more abstract concepts that seem to be common to most or all Aryan societies and continue to characterize those of their descendants. Perhaps in unconscious accord with the quaint Aryan custom of tripartition, I will try to identify three such traits and to elaborate on their significance.

# Cosmic Order

(1) The Cosmic Order: It is a widespread feature of early Aryan thought that there exists an objective order that is independent of what we believe or want to believe—in other words, truth. The *Rig Veda* calls this order *rta*, a term that may be linked with the word Arya itself, which seems to mean "noble" in *The Laws of Manu*. The word "Aryan" comes from "Arya" and a number of other Indo-European words seem to be connected—the Greek *arete* (virtue, the quality of acting like a man, from which we derive "aristocracy"); the Latin *ara* (altar) and the name "Arthur." But regardless of the linguistic linkages, the Aryan concept of Cosmic Order contrasts with ideas of the universe found among ancient non-Aryans. For the latter, Cosmic Order is merely the product of will, a creature of magic, and it can change if those who know how to change it wish to do so. If the priests or the divine king did not perform the proper magical rituals, the sun literally would not rise, the Nile would not flood, and food would not grow. In this non-Aryan, magical view of nature, order does not exist as an externally independent and objective arrangement of nature and its functioning.

While early Aryans did believe in and practice magic, theirs was not a world-view in which nature and the universe were dependent on magic. Magic could be used to influence nature (through love potions or ointments to make weapons stronger and the like), but nature itself exists apart from the tricks of the magicians and sorcerers. Indeed, throughout Western history, magicians and sorcerers almost always come from pre-Aryan Mother Goddess figures or from the non-Aryan Orient—from Egypt, Babylonia, or the "Magi" of pre-Aryan Persia, from whom we get the word "magic."

Moreover, Indo-European gods are considerably less powerful than the deities adored by the non-Aryans. Zeus, Apollo, Odin, Thor, and the rest did not create the universe and are in fact subject to most of its rules. The subordination of Aryan gods to the regularities of the universe itself points toward a deep Indo-European belief in Cosmic Order, a belief that has major philosophical and ethical implications.

It follows from recognition of the Cosmic Order that some things are true and some aren't, no matter what you prefer to think, that some things will always be and always have been true or false, regardless of your wishes, and that some things will happen or will not happen, whether you like it or not. Hence the Greek and Nordic ideas of "Fate" or "Destiny," that some things are beyond the control of the human will and are inevitable because of the very fabric of the universe. The concept of Fate is probably the origin of the principle of causality and the ancestor of such Indo-European ideas as logic, mathematics, philosophy, science, and theology.

While Egyptians and Babylonians collected a great deal of information about mathematics and astronomy and practiced impressive engineering on a grand scale, their "sciences" never had a really scientific basis. Their knowledge existed either as the lore collected by the priests or as the products of practical trial and error. Only the Indo-European Greeks actually systematized scientific and mathematical knowledge, and they were able to construct it into a system because the system itself was their concept of a Cosmic Order in which all events and phenomena were related through causality and its inexorable linkages of one event and phenomenon to another.

It is notable that Christian theology itself, as developed under the Scholastic theologians of the Middle Ages and under the influence of rationalistic Greek philosophy, reflects this underlying Indo-European belief, that even God behaves according to certain principles, just as Zeus and Odin did, and it is also interesting that today even Christian fundamentalists who wish to disprove the theory of evolution in behalf of their religious beliefs try to do so through "creation science." Among Indo-Europeans, even religion and the supernatural are subordinate to the ancient Aryan perception of a Cosmic Order that governs the universe from the remotest galaxies to the life-cycles of insects.

"It is no accident," wrote V. Gordon Childe, "that the first great advances towards abstract natural science were made by the Aryan Greeks

and the Hindus, not by the Babylonians or the Egyptians, despite their great material resources and their surprising progress in *techniques*—in astronomical observation for example. In the moralization of religion too Aryans have played a prominent rôle. The first great world religions which addressed their appeal to all men irrespective of race or nationality, Buddhism and Zoroastrianism, were the works of Aryans, propagated in Aryan speech…. It is certain that the great concept of the Divine Law or Cosmic Order is associated with the first Aryan peoples who emerge upon the stage of history some 3,500 years ago."[5]

It is from the Aryan concept of a Cosmic Order that modern white men derive their mental inclinations both to *universalism*, a tendency to think in terms of generalizations and abstractions that apply universally rather than in terms of the specific, local, and temporary, and to *objectivity*, the tendency to evaluate events and phenomena with reference to the general and the abstract, rather than to judge them subjectively, as they relate to themselves. While these traits account for many of the achievements of European Man, they also, as we shall see, help to explain many of his racial problems in more recent times.

# Ethical Implications

The concept of the Cosmic Order also has important ethical implications, and it was as an ethical system that the ancient Aryans mainly seem to have understood it. Recognition of a Cosmic Order implies that human action has consequences—that you cannot do whatever you please and expect nothing to come of it—and also that sometimes no matter what you do, you will not be able to avoid the consequences of your Fate, what the Greeks and Norsemen respectively called your *moira* or *wyrd*. Thus, the central concept of Greek tragedy is that the tragic hero suffers as a consequence of a "tragic flaw" that may not be the result of his will or intent but that makes his fate unavoidable. Oedipus was doomed to commit the sacrileges of patricide and incest through his very virtue, and there are many heroes in Greek mythology who encounter similar fates.

The ethical implication that Indo-Europeans drew from this belief is not that man should surrender or fecklessly seek to avoid his fate but rather that he should accept it courageously. Achilles in *The Iliad* knows that he is

fated to die young but, as horrid as death is to Achilles, he readily prefers the glory of his brief heroic life to the obscurity of a long and safe existence. By contrast Gilgamesh, in the Mesopotamian epic, seeks only to avoid death and resorts to all sorts of magic and sorcery to prevent it.

In her survey of Norse myth, H.R. Ellis Davidson notes similar connections between fate, Cosmic Order, and the heroism of both gods and men:

> In spite of this awareness of fate, indeed perhaps because of it, the picture of man's qualities which emerges from the myths is a noble one. The gods are heroic figures, men writ large, who led dangerous, individualistic lives, yet at the same time were part of a closely-knit small group, with a firm sense of values and certain intense loyalties. They would give up their lives rather than surrender these values, but they would fight on as long as they could, since life was well worth while. Men knew that the gods whom they served could not give them freedom from danger and calamity, and they did not demand that they should. We find in the myths no sense of bitterness at the harshness and unfairness of life, but rather a spirit of heroic resignation: humanity is born to trouble, but courage, adventure, and the wonders of life are matters of thankfulness, to be enjoyed while life is still granted to us. The great gifts of the gods were readiness to face the world as it was, the luck that sustains men in tight places, and the opportunity to win that glory which alone can outlive death.[6]

The Norse gods know that their race and the world are doomed at the final battle of Ragnarok, but they go out to fight and to meet their fate regardless. The concept of the "Last Stand," in which an outnumbered army of Aryan warriors faces battle against overwhelming odds, usually without any realistic expectation of victory, recurs throughout Indo-European history and legend—at the battles of Marathon and Thermopylae, Horatius at the Bridge, in the *Song of Roland*, in the Arthurian legends, at Ragnarok itself, or in the fiery climax of *Njál's Saga*, and at the Alamo, Rorke's Drift, and the Little Big Horn.

Indeed, Indo-European scholars have recognized a distinctive Indo-European myth pattern called the "Final Battle." As J.P. Mallory writes, "The epic traditions of a number of Indo-European peoples preserve an

account of the ‘final battle,’ for example, Kurukshetra in the great Indian epic, the *Mahabharata*; the ‘Second Battle of Mag Tured’ among the early Irish; Ragnarok among the Norse; and several others.”[7]

Moreover, the Indo-European hero, fighting in single combat, often is killed by treachery or trickery concocted by a non-Aryan or un-Aryan “trickster” figure. Thus, Achilles is killed by an arrow shot by the Trojan Paris, Hercules is killed by the trickery of a centaur, Theseus is pushed over a cliff from behind, Baldur is killed by the jealous trickery of Loki, Siegfried is killed by the treachery of his own brother-in-law, et cetera. It is interesting that in the biblical story of David and Goliath, the latter, a champion of the Aryan Philistines, is killed by the slingshot of David, and in the non-Aryan version recounted in the Old Testament, David’s conduct is portrayed as an act of prowess.

The Aryan concept of Cosmic Order is thus closely linked to the scientific and philosophical achievements of Indo-European Man as well as with his ethical ideas, especially with regard to Indo-European military behavior. The concept of Cosmic Order implied an essentially aristocratic obligation to carry out one’s duty regardless of the consequences but also a heroic recognition of what the consequences, including death and destruction, might be. While other races and cultures have certainly displayed and idealized courage, heroism, and struggle against odds, none has incorporated these ideals into its fundamental world-view and ethic as fully as Indo-European Man.

To say that belief in an external and objective cosmic order, independent of the human will and human action, is characteristic of the Aryan peoples is not to say that such an order actually exists, but rather that the Indo-European mind seems to be structured in such a way (perhaps due to neurological structures and processes peculiar to it), that it naturally thinks in terms of such an order and finds the world incomprehensible without it. In the absence of such a concept, we would be unable to make sense of the phenomena that we perceive; confronted by the mysteries of nature, life, and death, early Aryans sought to understand them by explaining them in terms of mythologies that reflected an underlying belief in a cosmic order and the duties it imposes on mortal men.

## Aryan Dynamism

(2) Faustian dynamism: This is the quality that Oswald Spengler described as the unique trait of what he called the "Western Culture," characterized by the "Faustian soul, whose prime-symbol is pure and limitless space, and whose 'body' is the Western Culture."[8] In a general sense, Spengler is referring to the innovative, aggressive, creative, mobile, aspiring, inventive, and daring qualities that have always characterized Indo-Europeans.

Spengler also sharply distinguished the Western Faustian Culture from the "Apollinian" and "Magian" Cultures of the classical age and the Near East; but in fact, in the broader sense in which we are using the term here, the Greeks and Romans were also Faustian, and the Greek myth of Prometheus, the Titan who defied Zeus by giving mankind the gift of fire and was condemned to eternal torture because of his disobedience, is as much a Faustian myth as the Germanic legend of Faust himself, who dared to bargain with the Devil to gain knowledge and power and lost his soul because of his bargain.

Many Greek heroes exhibit similar traits of daring and eventually come to grief because of them, and these myths functioned not only as expressions of the Faustian tendencies of the Aryan people to push against limits and transgress established boundaries but also as cautionary tales that tried to warn men of the consequences of carrying their natural proclivities too far. While there is a superficial resemblance between these myths and the Hebraic story of Adam and Eve, there is also a significant difference. While Indo-European heroes often meet their doom because of or despite their heroism, Adam and Eve get kicked out of Eden merely because they disobeyed Yahweh. Neither one did anything particularly admirable or heroic, in contrast to Prometheus, Achilles, Hercules, Theseus, and many other Greek and Aryan heroes.

The dynamism of the Aryans is clear enough in their earliest and most obvious habit of invading other peoples' territories and conquering them. All of these early Aryans were intensely warlike, and their gods, myths, and heroes reflect their devotion to the martial virtues of courage, discipline, honor, the goodness of conquest, and skill in arms and sports. Virtually everywhere they moved, they conquered, though their smaller numbers in comparison with the receiving populations usually meant that sooner or later they would be absorbed into the people they overcame in battle. This was certainly their eventual fate in India and the Near East, but in Europe,

despite a certain amount of racial mixture and cultural assimilation of pre-Aryan beliefs and institutions, they survived largely intact, probably because the receiving population was smaller and not as different from the conquerors as in Asia.

The dynamism of the early Aryans is also clear in their interest in travel, maritime exploration, colonization, and discovery. The Semitic Phoenicians also displayed great skill in this regard, but the Greeks equaled or excelled them in establishing colonies throughout the Mediterranean, exploring the Atlantic and African coasts, and penetrating as far as the Indian Ocean and the Far East, perhaps even circumnavigating Africa. The most famous traveler of antiquity was the historian Herodotus, who traveled all over the Near East and Egypt and invented the very concept of history in his account of his travels and the conflict between Greece and Persia.

Alexander of Madecon was a living incarnation of Aryan dynamism, conquering wherever he led his army and penetrating where no Greek had ever gone before. The racial cousins of the Greeks in late medieval Europe and the Viking adventurers of the early middle ages surpassed the Greeks, discovering the Americas and, in the case of the Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, French, and British, conquering new empires in Africa, Asia, and North and South America. The conquistadors of South America and the pioneers and settlers of North America reveal the same dynamic restlessness as the Germanic tribes that descended upon the Roman Empire. Their descendants today in the Aryan nations of the West stand on the edge of transcending them in their expansion into outer space itself.

But Aryan dynamism is not confined to military conquest and geographical exploration. It is also clear in the Faustian demand to understand nature. Just as Aryan warrior nomads overturned whatever cities and peoples stood in their path, so Aryan scholars and scientists, beginning with the Ionian philosophers of early Greece, have conquered nature and its mysteries, discarding myths, religions, and superstitions when they presented obstacles to their knowledge, and systematizing their discoveries and thought according to the Cosmic Order. Alexander the Great's solution of the Gordian Knot by simply slashing it to pieces with his sword is no less a racial trait of Aryans than the scientific achievements of Plato and Aristotle, Galileo and Newton, and hundreds of other scientists who were heirs of the ancient Aryans and who slashed through obscurantism and mythologies with their minds. Their descendants have cured diseases,

shrunk distances, raised cities out of jungles and deserts, constructed technologies that replace and transcend human strength, restored lost languages, recovered forgotten histories, stared into the hearts of distant galaxies, and reached into the recesses of the atom. No other people has ever even dreamed of these achievements, and insofar as other peoples even know such things are possible, it is because they have learned about them from European Man.

Afrocentrists, in their resentful and pathetic bitterness against whites, today pretend that it was their ancestors who created European civilization. The irony of their pretense is that their claims inadvertently acknowledge the superiority of the very civilization they hate, even as they try to claim it as their own. As for other civilized peoples, the Faustian dynamism of the Aryan race and civilization stand in stark contrast to the static primitivism and never-changing dullness that characterize the "fellahin" peoples of Asia, immersed in the fatalism and world-denying religions of the East. In travelogues and *National Geographic*, we are treated to picturesque accounts of the almost animal existences of these peoples, whose lives, work, and minds are often described as being "just what their ancestors were a thousand years ago." No phrase more accurately describes the differences between the perpetual passivity of the non-Aryan and the world-conquering activism and dynamism of the Aryans.

Critics of the Indo-Europeans often like to deflate Aryan contributions by pointing to the lateness of Aryan achievements in ancient times and by emphasizing that most of the basic inventions that made civilization possible were of non-Aryan origin. It is true that at the time the Aryans invaded Europe, the Near East, and India, literate, urban civilizations had flourished in those regions for some centuries or millennia and that the Aryans often merely destroyed whatever lay in their paths. It is also true that inventions such as the wheel, the alphabet, the compass, the stirrup, gunpowder, and printing were not of Aryan origin.

But the point is that while other, non-Aryan civilizations may have invented these tools, only when they fell into the hands of the dynamic Aryans did they lead to enduring achievements. The Phoenicians invented the alphabet, but neither the Phoenician language nor its literature survives today. Egyptians and Sumerians built cities, empires, and great temples long before history knows of the Aryans, but today their cities, empires, and temples lie in ruins; their languages are known only to scholars, and only

Indo-European scholars care about them. The Chinese may have invented the compass, gunpowder, printing, and the stirrup, but only Indo-Europeans have applied these inventions to the economic, political, and cultural conquest of the Earth. These achievements are due to the intrinsic dynamism, the Faustian creativeness, of the Indo-European mind and remain unparalleled by any other human race.

As for the lateness of Indo-European achievements, this is mainly a function of the geography of the "Aryan Homeland" in the Russian steppes, a region that furnishes few materials for building cities and lasting structures. What is striking about the Aryans, however, is that they did not remain in those regions; they conquered other, more desirable territories, took what they liked or needed from those they conquered, and over a period of about a millennium and a half after 1500 B.C. created a distinctively Aryan civilization that endures today. Those who repeat or swallow the cliché that "while white men were still running around in animal skins in northern Europe, non-Europeans were building cities and empires in Egypt and Asia" need to reflect that there were very few people at all in northern Europe at that time and that as soon as those who lived there or on the steppes became conscious of themselves as a people, they moved out of the north, conquered more comfortable climates, founded what we know today as Greece, Rome, Persia, and the Indo-Aryan civilization, and proved to be unstoppable by other, more civilized peoples who are now forgotten or remembered only because Indo-European scholarship has resurrected and preserved them.

## Self-Rule

It is also the dynamism of Indo-European man that accounts for the comparative absence of "Oriental despotism" in the political history of the Aryan peoples. Both Greece and Rome were originally ruled by kings, but the kings were never absolute monarchs and were elected or confirmed by the aristocratic warrior classes. Very early in their histories, the kings were dethroned, and republics, also originally aristocratic, were established. The Roman historian Tacitus noted similar institutions among the warrior bands of the ancient Germans, whom he held up in part as models of virtue against whom the decadent Romans of his day fell short. The passive proclivities

and static tendencies of non-Aryans render them easy to subjugate in such highly autocratic empires as those of Asia and ancient Egypt, imposed by slave armies often driven by whips and ruled by "god-kings" and colleges of priests armed with secret magical knowledge. It is almost impossible to dominate Aryans in this way for very long.

Greece not only gives us the word "democracy," but also the term "tyranny," which describes illegitimate rule. There is little in non-Indo-European thought similar to this concept. While Asiatic history is full of palace coups, harem intrigues, assassinations, and uprisings led by one minor potentate or another against a despot, all that ever happens, from the days of the Pharaoh Akhnaton to the assassination of Anwar Sadat, is the replacement of one autocrat by another. By contrast, the histories of Greece, Rome, and medieval and modern Europe are filled with acts of tyrannicide, political reforms, establishments of law codes and constitutions, baronial rebellions, peasants' uprisings, and eventually full-scale revolutions in which a dynamic race seeks to resist being reduced to slavery. Those despots who have gained power over Aryan peoples usually never last very long, and those who overthrow or assassinate them usually become heroic figures. The individuality and dynamism of Indo-European man simply does not tolerate one man or institution monopolizing all the power and dictating to everyone else.

This is clear enough in the histories of Greece and Rome, but it is also true of the ancient Germans. Historian Francis Owen thus describes the ancient Germanic political institutions:

> The state, if one may use that term, was composed of all the free men of the community. On certain occasions all the free men were called together, to give assent to certain projects which had already been considered by the council of elders and leaders. The assembly had the power to reject such proposals, and instances are known when such assemblies forced on the leaders a policy of war, because peace had become monotonous, and the hope of booty was a strong lure.
>
> These assemblies also had the power to elect the leaders in time of war, who for the time being had almost dictatorial power.[9]

Already in prehistoric times, then, the Germanic peoples exhibited an archaic form of republicanism that was fundamentally aristocratic in nature.

The "free men" of the community did not include all inhabitants but "the great mass of independent landowners and the wealthier or more aristocratic class of recognized families, which might be called the nobility."[10] The unfree, or "thralls," had no vote or standing in the assembly. The free men were also those who bore arms, and Tacitus describes their assemblies and how they conducted them:

> On matters of minor importance only the chiefs debate; on major affairs, the whole community. But even where the commons have the decision, the subject is considered in advance by the chiefs…. It is a drawback of their independent spirit that they do not take a summons as a command; instead of coming to a meeting all together, they waste two or three days by their impunctuality. When the assembled crowd thinks fit, they take their seats fully armed…. If a proposal displeases them, the people shout their dissent; if they approve, they clash their spears. To express approbation with their weapons is their most complimentary way of showing agreement.[11]

When the Framers of the American Constitution guaranteed the right to keep and bear arms, "being necessary to the security of a free State," they were following this ancient Aryan custom of the assembly of armed free men, and much the same custom was observed among the early Greeks and Romans.

Owen points to the dynamic quality of the ancient Germans as the ultimate reason for their disunity as well as their liberty, which characterized the warring kingdoms of medieval as well as modern Europe:

> But there were other more fundamental reasons why it was not possible to create a unified German state. These reasons are intimately connected with the inherent Germanic love of independence, the spirit of individualism and the respect for personality. These are all highly desirable qualities, but in an exaggerated form they do not facilitate the formation of political unity beyond a limited geographical area.[12]

The natural form of government among the Aryan peoples, then, appears to be this kind of aristocratic republic, tending toward democracy but with well-recognized rights and duties for non-aristocrats. A limited democracy thus has deep racial and cultural roots among Europeans, but it

properly derives from those roots, not from the rootless ideologies that today have grotesquely expanded it far beyond its natural role. The natural Aryan aristocratic republicanism is a form of government encouraged by the tripartite structure of Indo-European society; by its distinctions and balances between the warrior, priestly, and producer classes; by its tendency to separate the sacred from the secular; and by the apparently innate dynamism of the Aryan race itself, which resists and rebels against any effort to impose autocratic rule or to induce the passivity that allows despotism to flourish.

It is important to note that the despotism that eventually arose in ancient Rome was based on a non-Western, Asiatic, or Egyptian model and that the ancient Greeks always feared and distrusted citizens who became "Medized" (i.e., adopted the customs of the Medes or Persians and other Asians) as people who were alienated from their own institutions and who might harbor ambitions of enslaving their own people. In Rome the great model for despotism was Egypt, after Julius Caesar dallied with Cleopatra, and both Caligula and Nero tried to imitate Egyptian and Asiatic despotism (both were assassinated). Yet the Asiatic-Egyptian model of autocracy eventually triumphed, as Rome's racial composition altered with the importation and emancipation of large masses of foreign slaves and immigrants, and it was from this model that the Roman Catholic Church developed its own ideas of papal absolutism, which in turn were copied by the monarchs of the medieval and early modern periods. Despotism, even in its European forms, is not naturally an Indo-European institution but derives ultimately from alien peoples.

# Individuality

(3) The third important characteristic of the Indo-Europeans is individuality. From their earliest history they show signs of greater variation, in both physical appearance and individual behavior, than most other races. Some physical anthropologists have noted that there is more variety among Europeans than among Asiatics and Negroes, with whites exhibiting more variation in skin pigmentation, hair and eye color, height, and facial features. This physical differentiation is paralleled and perhaps

causally related to their behavioral differentiation as individuals, a trait that is closely related to their dynamism as a race.

Individuality or individuation in the sense I am using it is very different from "individualism," a modern ideology that may have been encouraged by racial individuation but is not the same thing. Individualism as an ideology is the belief that the individual is sovereign, that the individual man is self-sufficient, exists only for himself and his interests, and has claims against the group (society, the race, the nation, class, religion, et cetera). This ideology is in fact subversive of group loyalty and especially of racial consciousness and allegiances, and while people with a high degree of individuality may find it attractive, they need to remember that they, like every other human being, exist because of and within a group—the family and the community, as well as larger groups such as nation, cult, class, and race.

Early Aryans, despite their tendency to individuate, were highly conscious of themselves as a distinct group. Both the Greeks and the Romans looked upon everyone else as "barbarians," and we have already seen the high degree of racial consciousness that pertained among the Indo-Aryans. Aryans were also closely attached to family units, not only the nuclear family but also the clans in which their society was organized, and clan warfare in Ireland and Scotland, family-based political factionalism among the Romans, and conflicts among the many independent city-states of ancient Greece were notorious as forces that tended to keep these populations divided. It was groups such as race, nationality, clan, community, class, and family that established the social fabric of early Aryan life, and individualism in the modern sense of a John Stuart Mill or Ayn Rand—as a belief that justifies the individual's neglecting or betraying his social bonds—did not exist.

Nevertheless, the Aryans exhibited a high degree of individuation, and this is reflected in their mythology as well as in their art. The gods and heroes of the Greeks and the Norsemen have far more distinctive personalities than such Egyptian deities as Isis and Osiris, and the stories the Greeks and Norsemen told about their gods and heroes—the embittered and wrathful Achilles and the wily Odysseus, the imperious Zeus and the dashing Apollo, the angry Ares and the comic lame god Hephaestus, the jealous Hera and the lascivious Aphrodite—are far richer than the thin tales of Egypt and Babylonia. There is also a greater emotional and narrative

range—adventure, humor, love, revenge, divine punishment, and even tragic failure—in the Greek myths than in the stories of the Old Testament, which mainly illustrate man's obedience or disobedience to God and His laws.

With few exceptions, this range is also reflected in the art of the early Aryans in Europe—in the highly individuated and expressive statuary of the Greeks, as compared to the colossal but blank-faced images of the Egyptian pharaohs and Middle Eastern potentates, as well as in the highly developed literary and art forms of the later Europeans. European art and literature, far more than those of other peoples, give us the character, the individually distinctive human being, full of contradictory impulses but driven by some more than by others, characters we see in Greek drama, Homeric epic, Shakespearean plays, and the modern novel. Portraiture as well as statuary, dwelling on the individual external features to reveal the internal individual character, reflect much of the same trait, unlike the art forms of other races. Moreover, only in Western cultures has the lone hero become an ideal figure—not only the adventurer like Hercules or Theseus but also the lone explorer, the lone scientist, the lone scholar, thinker, poet, writer, often battling against daunting odds, persecution, or neglect. When Europeans invent things, they usually remember and honor the individuals who did it—the inventors who made the Industrial Revolution possible and those such as Samuel Morse, Alexander Graham Bell, Thomas Edison, the Wright brothers, and Henry Ford, who created the basic technologies of modern civilization working alone in their attics and basements.

Even the modern comic-book and film and television heroes of popular culture reveal this inherent Aryan tendency to go it alone, in the Lone Ranger, Superman and Batman, the heroes created by John Wayne and Gary Cooper, as do the myths of the American West, whether fictional, in James Fenimore Cooper's Natty Bumppo, or real, in Daniel Boone, David Crockett, Wild Bill Hickock, and Wyatt Earp. The lone Aryan hero, like Walt Disney's Davy Crockett, lives by the motto "Be sure you're right, then go ahead," a counsel of individuality, and then proceeds to fight legions of dark-looking badmen (whose black hats may symbolize non-Aryan origins), Indians, accented foreigners, or other suspiciously non-Aryan types. His ancestors Siegfried and Theseus fought and conquered the Nibelungs and the Minotaur of non-Aryan Crete in the same way.

But the Aryan hero also pays a price for his heroic individuality. He stands as the perpetual outsider, whose distinctiveness usually forbids him from enjoying a normal life with wife and children or living to a ripe old age, and eventually, in the authentic myths as opposed to TV drama, he is slain, usually by treachery. The moral of Aryan individuality is that there is no escape from the laws of the Cosmic Order, even for heroes, whose heroic transcendence of the norms that bind more mediocre men does not exempt them from the iron regularities of the universe. Individuality is not for everybody, an important distinction between the Aryan ideal and that of modern universalist individualism, and only exceptional beings can excel despite the demands it imposes on them.

Aryan individuality, then, was supposed to be a supplement to, not an adversary of, the racial and social bond, and even then it was constrained by the price that those who developed it to its highest levels would have to pay. It was never supposed to be the kind of intellectual crutch for economic greed, social inadequacy, and personal alienation and resentment that modern individualism is. But the ineradicable tendency of Aryans to individualize themselves through singular personalities, achievements, thoughts, and expressions in art and literature no doubt lies at the root of modern individualism, despite the socially pathological and destructive forms the ideology has taken, and it is in part because of his innate proclivity to individuation and individual achievement and creativity that European Man has given birth to his distinctive and successful civilization.

Describing the contours of ancient history, the great American Egyptologist James Henry Breasted saw the ancient world in terms of an epochal struggle between "our ancestors," the Indo-Europeans of Europe, Persia, and India, on the one hand, and the Semitic peoples of Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, Canaan, Assyria, and Carthage, on the other:

> The history of the ancient world, as we are now to follow it, was largely made up of the struggle between this southern Semitic line, which issued from the southern grasslands, and the northern Indo-European line, which came forth from the northern grasslands to confront the older civilizations represented in the southern line. Thus … we see the two great races facing each other across the Mediterranean like two vast armies stretching from Western Asia westward to the Atlantic. The later wars between Rome and Carthage represent some of

> the operations on the Semitic left wing, while the triumph of Persia over Chaldea is a similar outcome on the Semitic right wing.
>
> The result of the long conflict was the complete triumph of our ancestors (the Indo-European line), who conquered along the center and both wings and finally, as represented by the Greeks and Romans, gained unchallenged supremacy throughout the Mediterranean world. This triumph was accompanied by a long struggle for mastery between the members of the northern line themselves. Among them the victory moved from the east end to the west end of the northern line, as first the Persians, then the Greeks, and finally the Romans gained control of the Mediterranean and oriental world.[13]

In this passage, Breasted captured the grand sweep of the saga of European Man and his seemingly victorious, millennial conflict with his rivals. But what he does not say, and what perhaps was not apparent to him when he wrote in the early 20th century, was that the conflict is far from over. The Roman political and military victory was not the end of the story, because the very success of Roman imperialism made possible and perhaps inevitable the eventual inundation of their people and culture by those whom they had conquered. The importation of masses of alien slaves into Italy, their eventual emancipation, and the massive immigration of foreigners from the Asiatic parts of the empire meant that the Indo-European racial and cultural base of Rome would eventually die.

The Roman poet Juvenal's famous line that "the Orontes [the main river of ancient Syria] empties its garbage into the Tiber" expresses what was happening. (It is noteworthy he did not say the Rhine or the Thames empties its garbage into the Tiber.) Not only the peoples but also the religions and the political forms of the non-Aryan East crept over the Aryan imperium. Eventually, then, the non-Aryan rivals and enemies of the Aryans triumphed through a backdoor attack that is comparable to the backhandedness by which non-Aryans overcome Aryan heroes in the old myths.

Today, despite the conquest of virtually the entire planet by Indo-Europeans by the end of the 19th century, the same fate appears to face modern European Man. Only the European nations of the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and Europe itself face hordes of non-white immigrants who threaten to engulf us and our civilization. Having

conquered them through military combat and technological and economic progress, we nevertheless face racial and cultural extinction as the perversion of our strengths into weaknesses is exploited against us and our rivals seek victory through our back doors. European Man can survive today only if he begins to recognize that victory through honorable combat is not enough; he must also be prepared to meet the challenges on the level of cultural combat, and the only way he can do so is through recovery of his racial heritage, the roots of who we are and where we come from as a people.

# The Aryan Legacy

Throughout this essay, I have emphasized the ancient, archaic, and prehistoric expressions of the Indo-European peoples for two reasons. In the first place, examining the ancient patterns of behavior and thought among Aryans helps to exclude influences on them from more modern forces that have been acquired through the historical environment or are perhaps less "natural"—forces such as Christianity, philosophical and ethical systems, capitalism, and the modern ideologies of romanticism, individualism, socialism, capitalism, and liberalism. Secondly, by looking at the patterns of thought and behavior that seem to have been common to all or most of the early Aryan peoples, we can find what whites have in common and what distinguishes them from other races. When Aryans in medieval Ireland exhibit myths and beliefs very similar to those of ancient India, when Greek poets express ideas similar to those of Viking sea rovers, we are transcending the extraneous influences of other cultures and races, those acquired from the social and historical environment, and the physical environment, and are coming close to fundamental racial characteristics.

This survey of the ancient Aryans may seem as though it merely recounts cultural ideas and practices rather than racial characteristics, but as Jared Taylor noted in his own essay, "There is increasing evidence that personality traits … are under genetic control," and therefore we should expect to find that the deep cultural beliefs and practices that are common to members of a particular population that is descended from the same ancestors derive from genes carried by those ancestors. This claim cannot be proved, mainly because we obviously cannot conduct genetic analyses of

ancient Aryans, but given what we now know and are increasingly learning about the role of genetic forces (and therefore race) in shaping personality (and therefore culture), it seems to follow.

In the light of what we know of the early history of the Aryan peoples, then, we should be able to distinguish between those traits that are characteristic of our race and those that are not; between those that contribute or have contributed to our success as a population and as a people and those that have been destructive; and between those that continue to serve our identity and destiny, our consciousness as a people acting in history, and those that have been distorted or exploited to thwart our identity and destiny.

In his essay, Mr. Taylor identified by my count about 15 distinct traits that he believes constitute or derive from "a common thread to the modern characteristics of European man." In the light of what we know of early Aryan man, some of the characteristics that Mr. Taylor attributes to whites are valid, some are distortions of valid traits, and some, I believe, are merely acquisitions deriving from other forces (which is not to say that they are necessarily undesirable). But what is important is that any trait that is really a characteristic of whites must have existed long before modern culture and independently of cultural, historical, or local influences on white behavior.

Thus, several of the characteristics that Mr. Taylor attributes to whites appear to have their origin in the archaic, natural impulses of the early Aryan peoples, but it is highly misleading to say that the modern and especially American manifestations of these characteristics are distinctively Aryan, Indo-European, or white. Mr. Taylor is certainly correct that whites exhibit "an abiding sense of reciprocity, a conviction that others have rights that must be respected," but the modern expression of this trait in such institutions as democracy, free speech, and the rule of law are grotesquely distorted or exaggerated versions of the original and natural impulses.

The "sense of reciprocity" as well as the rule of law are no doubt reflections of the Aryan concept of Cosmic Order, a view of the universe that holds that both nature and man behave according to universal, perpetual laws or regular patterns and in which rights and duties are in balance. But the concept of Cosmic Order did not imply an egalitarian or homogeneous social order in which everyone is equal and there are no distinctions between groups, classes, sexes, races, and nations. Indeed, early

Aryan society was hierarchical, organic, and aristocratic; the natural form of Aryan government was an aristocratic republic in which distinct classes and social groups participated and expressed their views and interests freely, and a high level of political participation was necessary for such dynamic and restless populations of independent, armed free men as the early Aryans.

The mass democracies and homogenized, produce-and-consume cultures of modern times may ultimately derive from this Aryan social and political model, but they deviate from it in important ways. Free speech, for example, certainly seems to have pertained in the tribal assemblies, and it is doubtful if the early Aryans were such bluenoses as their Victorian descendants or such totalitarians as late 20th-century academics. But free speech did not include the right to commit sacrilege, subversion, or obscenity and was circumscribed by custom and the high courtesy that is universal among warrior peoples.

As noted earlier, the Aryan concept of Cosmic Order accounts for the European mental habits of universalism and objectivity. While these habits help explain European successes in science, mathematics, philosophy, ethics, and the rule of law, they also, in a misapplied and degenerate form, suggest why Europeans have shown a tendency to neglect their own racial interests and why they find developing their own racial consciousness so difficult. As Jared Taylor noted in his essay, every other race tends to think in terms of its own race and group, and, "Only whites pretend that pluralism and displacement are good things and that the measures necessary to ensure group survival may be immoral." We tend to think that way because we are naturally prone to transcend subjective and particular interests and to idealize what is objective and universal. But this misapplication of a natural and healthy Aryan instinct is not in itself natural but rather the result of ethical and philosophical confusions that have arisen in modern times.

Mr. Taylor is also correct in his remarks about sportsmanship, noblesse oblige, respect for foes in war, and respect for women, all of which derive from Aryan ideas about the Cosmic Order and from the warlike and heroic character of the early Aryans. All these traits reflect the nature of early Aryan warcraft—the single combat of individual champions, the unwritten and commonly understood rules of conflict, and acceptance of the terms of defeat have deep roots in the ways Aryans waged war. The comparative absence of needless brutality in Western warfare, until the advent of 20th-

century democracy, may be thought to derive from Christian ethics, but long before Christianity pagan conquerors such as Alexander the Great and Julius Caesar showed far less brutality in their warfare than such paladins of non-Aryan combat as Tamerlane, Genghis Khan, the Assyrians, the Huns, or even the ancient Hebrews, for whom genocide was a regular practice.

In Aryan society women have always enjoyed more respect, more freedom, and more individuality than in non-Aryan society, and this probably from the structure of their society. The relative independence and freedom that characterized the structured Aryan society would have meant that women could not simply be captured and enslaved but had to be bargained for or won, if not as individuals then as the daughters of other competing warriors. Disrespect for or cruelty to a woman, like discourtesy or injury to a free man, could result in endless blood feuds. Women and goddesses in Greek and Norse myths and legends have far more personality and a far more important social role than in most non-Aryan mythologies. Certainly such practices as foot-binding, clitoridectomy, and suttee, as well as polygamy and the harem, are rare or unknown among the early Aryans. (The word "harem" has entered Western languages because Westerners lack their own word for it.)

But the natural Aryan respect for women does not mean that modern feminism is consistent with ancient Aryan views of womanhood, and despite the honor that Aryans have always paid women, they never confused honor with equality or sameness. The assumption of the Aryan honoring of women is that women are different from men and require or deserve different treatment. It is for that very reason that modern feminists, wedded to the illusion of sexual egalitarianism, despise, ridicule, and try to abolish the expressions of male chivalry, even though, like most egalitarians, they also like to have it both ways—to abolish inequality when it offers an impediment but to insist on it when it serves their interests.

Similarly, respect for animals no doubt derives from the reliance of the Aryans on hunting and war animals, especially dogs and horses. Horses play a central role in Aryan myth, and the Indo-Europeans apparently were the first to domesticate horses and develop their use in war. There are sacred horses, horse sacrifices, horse gods, and horse burials among the Indo-European peoples. Similarly, dogs and wolves play a major role in Aryan myth, from Cerberus the three-headed dog of Hades (one for each social class perhaps) to the wolves of Odin. The individuation of Aryans may lead

them to personify their animals and invest them with personalities, names, and special attributes in a way that no other race usually does.

I do not see that such traits as missionary activity, the passion to improve or change the world, the elimination of hereditary class differences, competition according to individual ability, or concern for the natural environment are particularly characteristic of Aryans, however. Some of these may be desirable traits, though they have obviously gone far beyond what was really characteristic of early Aryans and what can be useful for white racial survival. Nevertheless, some of them, such as missionary activities and crusading to change or reform society, may well ultimately derive from Aryan dynamism and expansionism, while competition according to individual merit may be a modern form of single combat and a reflection of Aryan individuality. The modern demand to eliminate hereditary class distinctions may be an exaggerated but not very healthy version of this instinct.

What is important to understand, however, is that Aryans, because of their Faustian dynamism and individuality, seem to be especially prone to misapplications of their most ennobling traits, and when the modern ideologies of egalitarianism, leveling, feminism, and universalism are joined to forces such as modern capitalism and technology, the danger of losing contact with and understanding of the natural propensities of our own racial character and of misunderstanding their limits and proper functions is great.

I do not think there is any great mystery as to how this perversion of the Aryan legacy occurred. Aryans eventually constructed societies far more complex in their economies, technologies, and ideas than any other race, and the very complexity of their societies tended to confuse and derail traditional expressions of Aryan impulses. Ambitious leaders, Aryan or not, have often exploited these complexities, and the confusions that result, for their own advantage, and the disruptions of wars, revolutions, depressions, and new technologies and social organizations that periodically afflict Western society have added to the alienation of modern European Man from his natural inclinations and ancient heritage.

It ought to be obvious that we cannot expect to restore the warrior cultures of the early Aryans, their archaic religions and mythologies, and their social and political customs. But we can work to correct the misapplications of our talents and traits, to eradicate the confusions and

degenerations of modern mass democracy and culture, and eventually to restore or create anew a social, political, and cultural order that incorporates and reflects the healthy and natural instincts of our race. What we can do is learn from these ancient and noble warriors and their courage, their irrepressible restlessness and dynamism, and their heroically relentless realism; from them we can remember who we are and where we come from, what our most natural inclinations are and how those inclinations can help us or harm us, and, most of all, how we can make the enduring characteristics of our race serve us again in our endless quest to meet the destiny of European Man.

**Notes**

1. J.P. Mallory, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans: Language, Archaeology and Myth* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1989), p. 133.

2. Romila Thapar, *A History of India* (Baltimore, Md.: Penguin Books, 1966), pp. 37–38.

3. *The Laws of Manu*, Ed. and Trans. Wendy Doniger (New York: Penguin Books, 1991), 10: 57–61

4. C. Scott Littleton, *The New Comparative Mythology: An Anthropological Assessment of the Theories of Georges Dumézil* (rev. ed., Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973), p. 224.

5. V. Gordon Childe, *The Aryans: A Study of Indo-European Origins* (1926; reprint ed., New York: Dorset Press, 1987), pp. 4–5.

6. H.R. Ellis Davidson, *Gods and Myths of Northern Europe* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1964), p. 218.

7. Mallory, *In Search of the Indo-Europeans*, pp. 129–30.

8. Oswald Spengler, *The Decline of the West* (2 vols.; Trans. Charles Francis Atkinson; New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1926), vol. one, p. 183.

9. Francis Owen, *The Germanic People: Their Origin, Expansion and Culture* (New York: Dorset Press, 1990), p. 154.

10. Ibid., p. 153.

11. Tacitus, *Germany*, Trans. H. Mattingly and S.A. Handford, Ch. 11.

12. Owen, *The Germanic People*, p. 155.

13. James Henry Breasted, *The Conquest of Civilization* (New York: Literary Guild of America, 1938), pp. 200–202.

*This article originally appeared in the November and December 1996 issues of* American Renaissance.

* * *

* * *

# New Lies for Old

## The case of the Caucasoid skeletons.

*Francis here writes like the columnist that he was, beginning with a news story, adding his own commentary, and then pointing out the larger racial significance of the story. His point of departure is the intellectual straining among anti-racists over the discovery of prehistoric Caucasoid skeletons in the United States.*

*The best known of these is so-called Kennewick Man, found on the bank of the Columbia River near Kennewick, Washington, on July 28, 1996. Radiocarbon dating found the nearly complete skeleton to be approximately 9,300 years old. Anthropologists were eager to study the remains, but were thwarted by local Indian tribes who claimed that the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 gave them control over their "ancestor," whom they wanted to protect from scientific study.*

*Kennewick Man was the subject of intense litigation until February 4, 2004, when the 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the tribes—the Umatilla, Colville, Yakama, and Nez Perce—could not claim him as an ancestor. Indeed, according to one academic, a facial reconstruction from the skull looked more like a "European accountant than a Paleo-Indian hunter" (Glynn Custred, "The Forbidden Discovery of Kennewick Man,"* Academic Questions, *June 1, 2000, pp. 12–30). The bones are now at the Burke Museum at the University of Washington.*

*Prehistoric skeletons 10,000 or more years old have been found in Montana, California, Mexico, and Texas. Many show Caucasoid features.*

*

Whenever you get into a debate, you can almost always tell your opponent is hiding something when he starts piling up new arguments for his position in place of the old arguments you've already refuted. In the debate over IQ and race, this happens frequently.

First the argument was that IQ tests were culturally biased. But new IQ tests showed that the more you control for cultural bias, the larger the IQ differences between the races becomes. Then it was claimed that intelligence really can't be tested. But performance on IQ tests matched performance in school, academic tests, and professional success. Then they said "intelligence" doesn't really exist anyway. But intelligence is a concept that human societies have always recognized and would find it hard to abandon. Finally, the most recent argument has been that "race" doesn't really exist, that it's only a "social construct." Now even that defense of egalitarianism, an increasingly common one, is starting to shrivel.

But the shriveling isn't happening without a good deal of last-ditch egalitarian resistance. On April 17, 1997, the *Washington Post* reported in a front-page story that archaeologists have now found remains of quite a few prehistoric pilgrims to North America whose skeletons are—well—"Caucasoid." This is a problem for two reasons.

In the first place, as everyone who has seen the Eisner version of Walt Disney's *Pocahontas* knows, Caucasians were invaders who stole the country from the "First Americans"—namely the North American Indians, who, as *Post* staff writer Boyce Rensberger put it, "all resembled today's Asiatic peoples, popularly called Mongoloids." (Popularly? When was the last time you heard someone in a bar referring to Asians or Orientals as Mongoloids?) If the "First Americans" or "Native Americans" were really Caucasian, then maybe Mr. Eisner will have to remake his movie and a lot of textbooks will have to be rewritten. But more of that problem anon.

First, how could scientists tell the skeletons were Caucasian rather than Mongoloid? Identification, says the *Post* story, was "based on a scientific technique called craniofacial morphometric analysis. It involves detailed study of the shape of the skull and face, using a sophisticated method called multivariate analysis. In some cases, more than 60 different dimensions of a skull are measured and compared with comparable dimensions considered typical of specific racial groups."

But if race doesn't really exist, if it's just a "social construct," how can you identify the race of a skeleton? Mr. Rensberger (or his editors at Egalitarian HQ) tried to handle the difficulty manfully and sensitively. Here is their solution:

> Most anthropologists agree that races, as most people use the term, are socially defined groupings with no scientific definition. No physical traits are exclusively the property of one race or another. Still, anthropologists agree that certain combinations of measurements, chiefly of the face and skull, can be used to determine whether individuals belong to one population [!] or another. This is true primarily for groups [!!] that have been separated geographically for thousands of years.

Now in the first place, the above paragraph has nothing to do with the news content of the story. It is inserted purely for ideological instruction, to let readers know that the *Post* has not signed up with the *Bell Curve* boys who believe that race might really exist after all. Back in the good old days of the Soviet Union, *Pravda* probably had lots of paragraphs just like it. But in the second place, whether Mr. Rensberger or his editors realize it or not, they have just told their readers that race really does exist. It exists, not as a social construct or as "socially defined," but as an objective fact of nature. Hiding behind words such as "population" and "group" doesn't change a thing.

Class, for example, is a "social construct." You cannot tell someone's class by examining his skeleton. Nor can you tell his religion, nationality, regional origin, marital status, or favorite football team. But you can identify his race (and sex) because race is not "socially defined" but, like sex, is defined by nature.

As J. Philippe Rushton notes on page 235 of his *Race, Evolution, and Behavior*, "The view that race is only a social construct is contradicted by biological evidence. Along with blood protein and DNA data … forensic scientists are able to classify skulls by race." As behavioral geneticist Glayde Whitney wrote in the March 1997 issue *American Renaissance*, "it has already become obvious that there are substantial genetic differences between the races. It is trivial to identify unerringly the race of any individual, including mixes of various races. This fact should forever dispel the myth of racial equivalence. Fashionable nonsense to the effect that race is a social rather than a biological phenomenon is clearly and demonstrably false." Race, in other words, is a genetic construct, a natural construct, and social definitions have nothing to do with it.

The discovery of the Caucasoid skeletons in North America lets a lot of skeletons out of the scientific and journalistic closets, and some "scientists" whose job it is to guard those closets don't much like it. As the *Post* was careful to point out later in the same story, "Some anthropologists reject the Caucasoid label for the prehistoric skeletons."

Daniel Grayson of the University of Washington, for one, says that using the word "Caucasoid" "raises 'a red flag, suggesting that whites were here earlier and Indians were here later.'" Professor Grayson adds that using "the word," as the *Post* refers to the term "Caucasoid," "implies that the ancient peoples who reached the New World were like today's Europeans or American whites."

Well, this is obviously getting out of hand, and it brings us to the second problem raised by these ancient skeletons. Somebody might say that the Europeans who arrived after 1492 weren't such aggressive invaders after all, that they might even have had some right to come here, since their ancestors were here at least as early as "First Americans."

Hence, the *Post* is quick to point out that "some other anthropologists" (who remain unnamed) note that "the 'apparently Caucasoid' skeletons may represent a physical type that was not ancestral to today's Europeans…. In other words, the scientists say it is possible that it is only a coincidence that the ancient skeletons have features that resemble those of Europeans." Well, that's much better, because, you see, even though race doesn't really exist and is only a social construct, the prehistoric Caucasoids who came here were not of the same race as the later Caucasoid invaders.

Obviously, the white people who came to this continent 9,000 years ago didn't establish any political or cultural claim to the continent for modern whites, regardless of whether they were "ancestral" to them. Neither does the presence of Mongoloid ancestors of the modern Indians establish any political or cultural claim for their modern descendants. The claims of each group are based on what their more immediate ancestors contributed to the making of what is today American civilization and the American nation, and it ought to be fairly obvious that the modern European races (excuse me, I meant "population groups") had a bit more to do with that than the Kwakiutls and the Ojibwas.

But another obvious point is that modern racial egalitarians can't bear to look at the evidence from comparative anatomy and molecular genetics that now prances before their eyes, and they have to resort to the most grotesque

ideological and linguistic contortions to preserve the egalitarian myth that race doesn't exist. Newspapers such as the *Post* and some scientists such as (apparently) Professor Grayson are always happy to enlist themselves in the preservation of such myths, to the point that both science and journalism are imperiled. If the trend continues we might as well give the country back to the Caucasoids.

*This article originally appeared in the June 1997 issue of* American Renaissance.

* * *

* * *

# Race and the American Identity

## To claim that we are a "universal nation" is to deny the past.

*This article is adapted from remarks Francis gave at the 1998* American Renaissance *conference.*

*

In December 1991, as Pat Buchanan announced his candidacy for the Republican presidential nomination, the Republic was edified by the reflections of columnist George Will. Mr. Will quoted from a column by Mr. Buchanan to the effect that "No one questions the right of the Arabs to have an Arab nation, of China to be a Chinese nation…. Must we absorb all the people of the world into our society and submerge our historic character as a predominantly Caucasian Western society?" and then proceeded to explain what was wrong with the candidate's reasoning. Mr. Buchanan, he wrote,

> evidently does not understand what distinguishes American nationality —and should rescue our nationalism from nativism. Ours is, as the first Republican president said, a nation dedicated to a proposition. Becoming an American is an act of political assent, not a matter of membership in any inherently privileged group, Caucasian or otherwise. The 'Euro-Americans' who founded this nation did not want anything like China or Arabia—or any European nation, for that matter.

Mr. Will's bald assertion that America is a "nation" defined by no particular racial or ethnic identity and indeed by no particular content whatsoever is not unique. The best-known formulation of the same idea is the phrase popularized by Ben Wattenberg, that America is the "first universal nation," and indeed only this year the new Washington editor of

*National Review*, John J. Miller, has published a book, *The Un-Making of Americans*, in which he too asserts the universalist identity of the nation and uses that concept as the basis for endorsing virtually unlimited immigration. "The United States can welcome immigrants and transform them into Americans," Mr. Miller writes, "because it is a 'proposition country.'" The proposition by which the American nation defines itself, the sentence fragment from the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, means that the

> very sense of peoplehood derives not from a common language but from their adherence to a set of core principles about equality, liberty, and self-government. These ideas … are universal. They apply to all humankind. They know no racial or ethnic limits. They are not bound by time or history. And they lie at the center of American nationhood. Because of this, these ideas uphold an identity into which immigrants from all over the world can assimilate, so long as they, too, dedicate themselves to the proposition.

Nor is the idea of America as a universal nation confined to the contemporary right. Historically, it is based on a core concept of the left, born in the salons of the Enlightenment and underlying the French Revolution's commitment to a universal "liberty, equality, and fraternity"—which was sometimes imposed at the points of rather unfraternal bayonets. Today it continues to inform the American left as well as the right. Bill Clinton himself last year cited the projected racial transformation of the United States from a majority white to a majority non-white country in the next century as a change that "will arguably be the third great revolution in America … to prove that we literally can live without in effect having a dominant European culture. We want to become a multi-racial, multi-ethnic society. We're not going to disintegrate in the face of it." More recently, in remarks at commencement exercises at Portland State University in Oregon in June, Mr. Clinton praised the prospect of virtually unlimited immigration as a "powerful reminder that our America is not so much a place as a promise, not a guarantee but a chance, not a particular race but an embrace of our common humanity."

The idea of America as a universal nation, then, is an idea shared by and increasingly defining both sides of the political spectrum in the United

States. The fact that the right, in such persons as Mr. Will, Mr. Wattenberg, and Mr. Miller, to name but a few, does share that idea with Mr. Clinton helps explain why the right today can think of nothing better to criticize the president for than his sex life and his aversion to telling the truth. Any substantial criticism of his globalist foreign policy, his defense of affirmative action, his policy of official normalization of homosexuality, his support for mass immigration, and in particular his "national dialogue on race" would involve a criticism and a rejection of the universalist assumptions on which those policies are based.

The common universalist assumptions of both left and right, then, are a major reason for the rapid convergence of left and right in our political life. They are the reason why, to coin a phrase, there is not a dime's worth of difference between them on so many issues and a major reason why we are seeing the emergence, not just of a One Party State in the United States, but also of a Single Ideology that informs the state and the culture. As I discovered myself, those who dissent from the Single Ideology of a Universal Nation or Proposition Country are not allowed to express their views even in self-proclaimed conservative newspapers, and it is hardly an accident that Mr. Miller accuses me in his recent book of what he calls "racial paranoia." Prior to his elevation to *National Review*, he admitted that he had "wanted to run [me] out of polite society for months, if not for years." Nor am I the only journalist to discover that you get "run out of polite society" for departing from the Single Ideology of Universalism. Joe Sobran, the *New York Post*'s Scott McConnell, and *National Review*'s Peter Brimelow have all met the same fate for essentially the same reason, though all of them remain in circles rather more polite than the ones I travel in.

But the most casual acquaintance with the realities of American history shows that the idea that America is or has been a universal nation, that it defines itself through the proposition that "all men are created equal," is a myth. Indeed, it is something less than a myth, it is a mere propaganda line invoked to justify not only mass immigration and the coming racial revolution but also the erosion of nationality itself in globalist free trade and a One World political architecture. It also justifies the total reconstruction and re-definition of the United States as a multi-racial, multi-cultural, and transnational swamp. Nevertheless, the myth of the universal nation or proposition country is widely accepted, and today it represents probably the

major ideological obstacle to recognizing the reality and importance of race as a social and political force.

In the first place, it is not true, as Miller writes, that the "Proposition" that "all men are created equal" and the ideas derived from it are universal and "not bound by time or history." If that were true, there would never have been any dispute about them, let alone wars and revolutions fought over them. No one fights wars about the really self-evident axioms of Euclidean geometry. Mr. Miller's propositions are very clearly the products of a very particular time and place—late 18th-century Europe and America—and would have been almost inconceivable 50 years earlier or 50 years later. Nor have they ever appeared in any other political society at any other time absent their diffusion from Europe or America. They are based on concepts of anthropology and history, including an entirely fictitious "state of nature," a "social contract," and a view of human nature as a tabula rasa, that no student of human society or psychology took seriously after the mid 19th century.

Secondly, it is by no means clear what the proposition that "all men are created equal" does mean, either objectively or in the minds of those who drafted and adopted it in the Declaration. Assuming that "men" means women and children as well as men, does it mean that all humans are born equal, that they are equal, or that they are created equal by God? If they are born or created equal, do they remain equal? If they don't remain equal, why do the rights with which they are supposedly endowed remain equal, or *do* those rights remain equal? If they are created equal by God, how do we know this, and what does it mean anyway? We certainly do not know from the Old Testament that God created all men equal, because most of it is about the history of a people "chosen" by God and favored by Him above others. Does it mean that God created humans equal in a spiritual sense, and if so, what does that spiritual equality have to do with political and social or even legal equality? Or does it mean that we were created equal in some material or physical sense, that we all have one head and two legs and two arms and so forth? If it means the latter, it is true but platitudinous.

In short, taken out of the context of the whole document of the Declaration and the historical context and circumstances of the document itself, the "equality clause" of the Declaration opens so many different doors of interpretation that it can mean virtually anything you want it to mean. It has been invoked by Christians and freethinkers, by capitalists and

socialists, by conservatives and liberals, each of whom merely imports into it whatever his own ideology and agenda demand. Taken by itself, it is open to so many different interpretations that it has to be considered one of the most arcane—and one of the most dangerous—sentences ever written, one of the major blunders of American history.

Yet, if the sentence is taken to imply that race and other natural and social categories are without meaning or importance, it ought to be clear that America as a historic society has never been defined by that meaning. The existence of slavery at the time of the Declaration and well after, and the fact that no small number of the signers of the Declaration were slave owners and that some parts of Jefferson's original draft denouncing the slave trade were removed because they were objectionable to Southern slave owners ought to make that plain on its face.

The particularism, racial and otherwise, that made the American people a nation was very clearly seen by John Jay, in a now famous passage of *The Federalist Papers*, No. 2:

> Providence has been pleased to give this one connected country to one united people—a people descended from the same ancestors, speaking the same language, professing the same religion, attached to the same principles of government, very similar in their manners and customs….

The racial unity of the nation is clear in Jay's phrase about "the same ancestors," and with respect to the U.S. Constitution, although the words "slave" and "slavery" did not appear in the text until the 13th Amendment, the Constitution is, as historian William Wiecek of Syracuse Law School writes, "permeated" with slavery:

> So permeated was the Constitution with slavery that no less than nine of its clauses directly protected or referred to it. In addition to the three well-known clauses (three-fifths, slave trade, and fugitive slave), the Constitution embodied two clauses that redundantly required apportionment of direct taxes on the federal-number basis (the purpose being to prohibit Congress from levying an unapportioned capitation on slaves as an indirect means of encouraging their emancipation); two clauses empowering Congress to suppress domestic insurrections,

> which in the minds of the delegates included slave uprisings; a clause making two provisions (slave trade and apportionment of direct taxes) unamendable, the latter providing a perpetual security against some possible antislavery impulse; and two clauses forbidding the federal government and the states from taxing exports, the idea being to prohibit an indirect tax on slavery by the taxation of the products of slave labor.

Moreover, as Professor Wiecik notes, with respect to the changes in the Constitution after the Civil War:

> Only by recognizing the extent to which the constitutional vision of Lincoln and the Republicans was a departure from the original Constitution can we understand the long struggles through the war, Reconstruction, and after to incorporate black Americans into the constitutional regime. Freedom, civil rights, and equality for them were not the delayed but inevitable realization of some immanent ideal in the Constitution. On the contrary, black freedom and equality were, and are, a revolutionary change in the original constitutional system, truly a new order of the ages not foreseen, anticipated, or desired by the framers.

But even aside from slavery, the persistence of clear and widespread recognition of the reality and importance of race throughout American history shows that Americans never considered themselves a universal nation in the sense intended today. Historian David Potter writes:

> The “free” Negro of the northern states of course escaped chattel servitude, but he did not escape segregation, or discrimination, and he enjoyed few civil rights. North of Maryland, free Negroes were disfranchised in all of the free states except the four of upper New England; in no state before 1860 were they permitted to serve on juries; everywhere they were either segregated in separate public schools or excluded from public schools altogether, except in parts of Massachusetts after 1845; they were segregated in residence and in employment and occupied the bottom levels of income; and at least four states—Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, and Oregon—adopted laws to prohibit or exclude Negroes from coming within their borders.

Nor were blacks the only non-white racial group to be excluded from civic membership. The first naturalization act passed by Congress under the Constitution in 1790 limited citizenship to "white men," and even after citizenship was granted to blacks through the 14th Amendment, naturalization continued to be forbidden to Asians: to Chinese until World War II, and to Japanese even later. Racial and ethnic restrictions on immigration remained in federal immigration law until 1965, when they were removed after sponsors of the reform assured opponents that removing them would not alter the ethnic and cultural composition of the nation—an assurance we now know to have been false.

As late as 1921, Vice President-elect Calvin Coolidge wrote an article on immigration called "Whose Country Is This?" in the popular women's magazine *Good Housekeeping*. He wrote:

> There are racial considerations too grave to be brushed aside for any sentimental reasons. Biological laws tell us that certain divergent people will not mix or blend. The Nordics propagate themselves successfully. With other races, the outcome shows deterioration on both sides. Quality of mind and body suggests that observance of ethnic law is as great a necessity to a nation as immigration law.

Not only the white but the Northern European racial identity of the nation could thus be publicly affirmed by a leading national political figure in a widely read magazine as late as the 1920s.

What Coolidge wrote then was by no means exotic or alien. Thomas Jefferson's views of racial equality are probably well known to *American Renaissance* readers. In *Notes on the States of Virginia*, he discussed the significant natural differences between the races, and while he was, at least in principle, opposed to slavery, he was adamantly in favor of forbidding free blacks to continue to live within the United States. Nor did he favor non-European immigration into the Northwest Territory nor into the lands of the Louisiana Purchase. In 1801 he looked forward to the day "when our rapid multiplication will expand itself … over the whole northern, if not the southern continent, with a people speaking the same language, governed in similar forms, and by similar laws; nor can we contemplate with satisfaction either blot or mixture on that surface."

James Lubinskas wrote an excellent article in the August 1998 *American Renaissance* on the American Colonization Society, a society that sought the expatriation of blacks to Africa, and which included as members Henry Clay, James Madison, Andrew Jackson, Daniel Webster, James Monroe, John Marshall, Winfield Scott, and many other of the most prominent American public leaders. They may have held different views of slavery and race, but none of them believed that free blacks should or could continue to live in the same society with whites.

Nor did Abraham Lincoln entertain egalitarian views of blacks, and his clearest statements on the subject are to be found in the course of his debates with Stephen Douglas during the Illinois senatorial campaign of 1858. While opposing the extension of slavery to new states, Lincoln repeatedly assured his audiences that he did not believe in or favor civic equality for blacks. In the debate at Charleston, Ill., on September 18, Lincoln said:

> I will say that I am not nor ever have been in favor of bringing about in any way the social and political equality of the white and black races: that I am not nor ever have been in favor of making voters of the free negroes, or jurors, or of qualifying them to hold office, or to intermarry with white people. I will say in addition that there is a physical difference between the white and black races which I suppose will forever forbid the two races living together upon terms of social and political equality, and inasmuch as they cannot so live that while they do remain together there must be a position of superior and inferior, that I as much as any other man am in favor of having the superior position being assigned to the white man.

He repeated this and similar ideas throughout the debates. Lincoln also was strongly in favor of expatriation for blacks and seriously explored the practicality of establishing a black settlement in Central America. Indeed, he proposed what would have become, had it passed, the 13th Amendment to the Constitution permitting federal support for the colonization of blacks outside the country.

In his annual message to Congress in December 1862, in which Lincoln made this proposal, he said:

> That portion of the earth's surface which is owned and inhabited by the people of the United States is well adapted to be the home of one national family, and it is not well adapted for two or more. Its vast extent and its variety of climate and productions are of advantage in this age for one people, whatever they might have been in former ages. Steam, telegraphs, and intelligence have brought these to be an advantageous combination for one united people.

He obviously was thinking, as a unionist, of what he regarded as the inappropriateness of secession, but he was also thinking of the inappropriateness of a different "people" or race inhabiting the same territory, and his remarks are thus a fairly clear expression of what can only be called racial nationalism.

As for Stephen Douglas, he was even more outspoken on the issue of race than Lincoln. (The following passage from his opening speech in the debates is from the edition published in 1993 by Harold Holzer, which incorporates into the text the audience responses as recorded by the newspapers of the day, in this case the *Chicago Daily Times*, a Democratic paper.)

> For one, I am opposed to Negro citizenship in any form. [Cheers—*Times*] I believe that this government was made on the white basis. ['Good,'—*Times*] I believe it was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever, and I am in favor of confining the citizenship to white men—men of European birth and European descent, instead of conferring it upon Negroes and Indians, and other inferior races. ['Good for you. Douglas forever,'—*Times*]

Douglas, of course, won the election.

Nor, even after the end of the war, during congressional debates on the 14th Amendment—which today is considered the cornerstone of federal enforcement of egalitarian policies—even then, there was no endorsement of racial equality. Thaddeus Stevens, whom constitutional historian Raoul Berger calls the "foremost Radical" in Congress, was not in the least committed to black voting. He was mainly concerned with perpetuating the domination of the Republican Party. It suddenly began to dawn on the Radicals that with the abolition of slavery, the three-fifths clause of the

Constitution, which had limited Southern representation in Congress, was no longer meaningful. The result would be that Southern representation in Congress would be vastly increased to the point that the South, just defeated in the war, would suddenly gain political dominance.

As Professor Berger writes:

> Now each voteless freedman counted as a whole person; and in the result Southern States would be entitled to increased representation and, with the help of Northern Democrats, would have, as Thaddeus Stevens pointed out at the very outset of the 39th Congress, 'a majority in Congress and in the Electoral College.' With equal candor he said that the Southern States 'ought never to be recognized as valid states, until the Constitution shall be amended … as to secure perpetual ascendancy' to the Republican Party.

The 14th Amendment was passed in order to grant the federal government the authority to enforce the Civil Rights Act of 1866, and the meaning of the language of the amendment is clarified by the debates over the earlier law. The Civil Rights Act was mainly intended to overcome the so-called Black Codes imposed on blacks after the end of slavery and the war, and it gave to "the inhabitants of every race … the same right to make and enforce contracts, to sue, be parties, and give evidence, to inherit, purchase, lease, sell, hold, and convey real and personal property, and to full and equal benefit of all laws and proceedings for the security of person and property, and shall be subject to like punishment … and no other." In explaining the language of the bill to the House, Rep. James Wilson of Iowa, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, was explicit about the limits of the bill:

> What do these terms mean? Do they mean that in all things, civil, social, political, all citizens, without distinction of race or color, shall be equal? By no means can they be so construed…. Nor do they mean that all citizens shall sit on juries, or that their children shall attend the same schools. These are not civil rights and immunities. Well, what is the meaning? What are civil rights? I understand civil rights to be simply the absolute rights of individuals, such as 'The right of personal

security, the right of personal liberty, and the right to acquire and enjoy property.'

Rep. James Patterson of New Hampshire, a supporter of the 14th Amendment, said much the same. He was opposed to "any law discriminating against [blacks] in the security of life, liberty, person, property, and the proceeds of their labor. These civil rights all should enjoy. Beyond this I am not prepared to go, and those pretended friends who urge political and social equality … are … the worst enemies of the colored race." Republican Sen. Lyman Trumbull of Illinois, who drafted the Civil Rights Bill, concurred. "This bill is applicable exclusively to civil rights. It does not propose to regulate political rights of individuals; it has nothing to do with the right of suffrage, or any other political right."

What the framers of the Civil Rights Act of 1866 and the 14th Amendment were proposing, in other words, was simply to extend to the emancipated black slaves what is generally called "equality under the law," a concept of equality that merely recognizes the equality of citizens and does not rest on any supposition of the natural equality of human beings. Equality under the law demands that the same fundamental civil rights belong to all citizens—what are often called the "Blackstonean rights" of life, personal liberty, and property—and which were generally agreed to be the content of the "inalienable rights" mentioned in the Declaration.

But these basic civil rights were sharply distinguished from "political rights" such as voting or holding office. The Blackstonean rights are fundamental because it is not possible for an individual citizen to function without them—to live without security of being murdered or being abducted or imprisoned or enslaved or having his property stolen. If the black population were not going to be enslaved and not going to be colonized abroad, it was essential that ex-slaves possess these basic civil rights simply in order to function in society; but the Blackstonean civil rights have nothing to do with voting, holding political office, sitting on juries, racial intermarriage, getting a job or being promoted, or school integration, which is what the concept of "civil rights" has come to mean today.

It would be possible to continue with an almost inexhaustible list of quotations from prominent American statesmen and intellectual leaders well into the 20th century abjuring any belief in the equality of the races or any

belief that non-white races should or can have the same political position as whites in the United States. I will not rehearse all of them, but my purpose in what I have said so far is not to invoke all these institutions and ideas about race in American history as a model of what we should seek to restore or because I necessarily agree with all the views of race that have been expressed throughout our history (indeed, some of them are more or less contradictory), but to reinforce two points: First, we are not and never were a "universal nation" or a "proposition country" defined by the equality clause of the Declaration or the bromides of the Gettysburg Address. On the contrary we—Americans in general and our public leaders in particular—repeatedly and continuously recognized the reality and importance of race and the propriety of the white race occupying the "superior position," and indeed it is difficult to think of any other white-majority nation in history in which recognition of the reality of race has been so deeply embedded in its thinking and institutions as in the United States.

Second, whatever we think of that history and its recognition of race, we have to understand that the current propaganda line about being a universal nation is not only a totally false account of American history but also is a prescription for a total rejection of the American past and the national identity as we have always known it. Racial universalism is not simply an adjustment or a "reform," let alone a continuation of the proper direction of American history, but a revolutionary reconstruction of the American identity.

In a 1996 article and a later book on Thomas Jefferson, historian Conor Cruise O'Brien demands that we eject Jefferson from our national pantheon precisely because of his views of race. O'Brien has a point that is perfectly logical if you accept his premise that America should be, even if it never has been, a universal nation. If indeed we are or should be a universal nation, then Thomas Jefferson must go. If indeed race is a meaningless "social construct" and a device for repression and exploitation as we are commanded to believe, then Jefferson was one of the main architects of and spokesmen for racial tyranny. But let us be aware that Jefferson is not the only god who has to be dethroned. If Jefferson must go, so must George Washington, and indeed, Washington's name has already been removed from a public school in New Orleans because he was a slaveholder.

But Abraham Lincoln has to go as well, and so must Theodore Roosevelt and the leaders of the American Colonization Society and the

framers of the 14th Amendment and so must virtually every other president and public leader in American history. You cannot have it both ways: either you define the American nation as the product of its past and learn to live with the reality of race and the reality of the racial particularism and racial nationalism that in part defines our national history, or you reject race as meaningful and important, as anything more than skin color and gross morphology, and demand that anyone, past or present, who believes or believed that race means anything more than that be demonized and excluded from any positive status in our history or the formation of our identity. If you reject race, then you reject America as it has really existed throughout its history, and whatever you mean by "America" has to come from something other than its real past.

That of course is exactly what President Clinton is telling us when he gloats that "we literally can live without in effect having a dominant European culture. We want to become a multi-racial, multi-ethnic society." And that also is what we are being told by contemporary liberalism. In 1997, the *New Republic* published an article by George P. Fletcher, professor at the Columbia Law School, in which Professor Fletcher argued:

> The republic created in 1789 is long gone. It died with the 600,000 Americans killed in the Civil War. That conflict decided once and forever that the People and the States do not have the power to govern their local lives apart from the nation as a whole. The People have no power either to secede as states or to abolish the national government.

The reason the Old Republic died, according to Professor Fletcher, is that it "was grounded in a contradiction" that "glorified the freedom of some and condoned the slavery of others." The new Constitution, he tells us, "begins to take hold in the Gettysburg Address, in which Lincoln skips over the original Constitution and reconstitutes it according to the principles of equality articulated in the Declaration of Independence." As a matter of historical fact, Professor Fletcher is more or less correct. The Civil War did destroy the Old Republic, and the new state that arose from it is defined, at least today, as a universalist and egalitarian regime based on the equality proposition of the Declaration. What he does not tell us, however, is how the new regime can be a legitimate one, since it is, by his own admission, simply the result of victorious military power and not of consent or legal

authorization by the representatives of the old regime. It is easy enough to destroy an existing constitutional order, but quite a different matter to construct one.

Nevertheless, the significance of Professor Fletcher's article is that it makes perfectly clear what we are facing from the contemporary supporters of universalism, whether of the left like Professor Fletcher himself or President Clinton or of the "right" like John Miller. What we are facing and what they are advocating is in no sense a continuation of American history or the American national identity as it has existed throughout our history, but rather a revolutionary reconstruction of the nation, a reconstruction that ruthlessly follows the logic of Mr. O'Brien's exclusion of Jefferson in excluding just about everything else characteristic of the Old Republic. The old identity and everything associated with it have to be excluded because their embrace of non-egalitarian and non-universalist institutions are simply incompatible with the new republic. Once we understand that, most of the universalists' actions, policies, and ideas are perfectly logical. What they are aiming at is precisely what William Wiecek described in a passage I quoted earlier, "a revolutionary change in the original constitutional system, truly a new order of the ages not foreseen, anticipated, or desired by the framers."

And not desired by most Americans today, either, at least not by those white Americans who grasp what is going on. As Peter Brimelow notes in his book on immigration, *Alien Nation*, Americans have never been asked whether they think it's a good thing for their nation to undergo the transition from a white majority to a non-white majority country. They have indeed been lied to about the transition, in being told in 1965 that it wouldn't happen, but until President Clinton embraced it last year, no president has even bothered to mention it.

If white Americans do not desire the transition, they still have a short time to prevent it and to try to salvage what is left of the Old Republic most of them still imagine they live in, and if they do wish to salvage it, they will have to reject, as clearly and firmly as the original Framers did, the universalism and egalitarianism that now threaten to destroy them and their race. Political philosophies and constitutional forms come and go, but nations—peoples and races—remain. Yet without the common blood that made us a nation in the first place, there will be no American nation, no matter what abstractions and forms we vainly invoke.

*This article originally appeared in the December 1998 and January 1999 issues of* American Renaissance.

* * *

* * *

# The Origins of “Racism”

## The curious beginnings of a useless word.

The *Oxford English Dictionary* is a multi-volume reference work that is one of Western scholarship’s most remarkable achievements—the standard dictionary of the English language on what are known as “historical principles.” Unlike most dictionaries, the *OED* also provides information on the first historical appearance and usage of words. The range of the erudition in the *OED* is often astounding, but for *American Renaissance* readers, one of its most interesting entries is for the word “racism.”

According to the second edition (1989) of the *OED*, the earliest known appearance of the word “racism” in English occurred in a 1936 book by the American “fascist” Lawrence Dennis, *The Coming American Fascism*. The second appearance of the term in English that the *OED* records is in the title of a book originally written in German in 1933 and 1934 but translated into English and first published in 1938—*Racism*, by Magnus Hirschfeld, translated by Eden and Cedar Paul. Since Hirschfeld died in 1935, before the publication of Dennis’s book the following year, and had already used the word extensively in the text and title of his own book, it seems only fair to recognize him rather than Dennis as the originator of the word “racism.” In the case of the word “racist” as an adjective, the *OED* ascribes the first known appearance to Hirschfeld himself. Who was Magnus Hirschfeld and what did he have to tell us about “racism”?

Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935) was a German-Jewish medical scientist whose major work was in the field of what came to be known as “sexology”—the scientific study of sex. Like Havelock Ellis in England and Alfred Kinsey in the United States, Hirschfeld was not only among the first to collect systematic information about sexuality but was also an apostle of sexual “liberation.” His major work was a study of homosexuality, but he also published many other books, monographs, and articles dealing with sex. He wrote a five-volume treatise on “sexology” as well as some 150 other works and helped write and produce five films on the subject.

It is fair to say that his works were intended to send a message—that traditional Christian and bourgeois sexual morality was repressive, irrational, and hypocritical, and that emancipation would be a major step forward. His admiring translators, Eden and Cedar Paul, in their introduction to *Racism*, write of his "unwearying championship of the cause of persons who, because their sexual hormonic functioning is of an unusual type, are persecuted by their more fortunate fellow-mortals." Long before the "sexual revolution" of the 1960s, Magnus Hirschfeld was crusading for the "normalization" of homosexuality and other abnormal sexual behavior.

Hirschfeld was the founder of an "Institute for Sexual Science" in Berlin and helped organize "sexology" on an international scale. In 1922, he was physically attacked and almost killed by anti-Semites in Munich. In May 1933, the Nazis closed down his Institute of Sexual Science and Hirschfeld fled to France, where he lived until his death in 1935.

*Racism* is largely devoted to a highly polemical "refutation" of some of the main racial ideologies and theories of the 19th and 20th centuries. The writers whom Hirschfeld criticized, aside from his favorite target of the National Socialists themselves, were figures such as Arthur de Gobineau, Vacher de LaPouge, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and others generally denounced today as "pseudo-scientists." In fact, that is an inappropriate term. Some of them were not trying to write as scientists at all but rather as political theorists, while others are better described as pre-scientific writers on race who worked with inadequate information, concepts, methodology, and terminology. While Hirschfeld may have been correct in rejecting their more egregious errors, his sneering at them for these mistakes is rather like ridiculing Copernicus and Kepler because they continued to accept some erroneous ideas from medieval astronomy.

Even when Hirschfeld is right in his critique of the early race theorists, it is often because he has chosen easy targets. His "refutation" of "racism" is largely centered on irrelevant commonplaces that even extreme exponents of racial differences might readily acknowledge—that all human beings are part of the same species and can interbreed, that blood transfusions can take place between races, that "there is no such thing as a pure race," that the races are identical in the vast majority of physical characteristics, that cephalic index is not a meaningful measurement of intelligence or character, et cetera. Yet his "scientific" evidence is often merely anecdotal or simply his own opinion asserted as unquestioned truth.

In another section, he recounts the names of those he considers the 70 most outstanding figures in world history and announces that "all such lists, when made without bias, will show that persons of genius and persons of outstanding talent are not set apart from the ruck by any colour of their eyes, by a peculiar shape of the skull or the nose, by any 'ethnological' characteristics whatever. What is decisive in human beings is not race but individuality." It does not seem to occur to Hirschfeld that all but about 8 or 9 of the 70 world-historical figures on his list are white Europeans. There are no Negroes and only two Asians: Confucius and Sun Yat Sen.

It is interesting that for all his contempt for "racism," Hirschfeld never once mentions IQ studies or the considerable psychometric evidence about race and intelligence that was already available even in the 1930s. Most of Hirschfeld's polemic is aimed at the proponents of intra-European racial differences (Nordics, Alpines, Mediterraneans, Dinarics, et cetera) and not at differences between whites and other major races (though he steadfastly denies such differences as well). Curiously, he never cites the work of Franz Boas and his disciples against "racism," though that work was available in Europe at the time, nor does he invoke the ideas of the Frankfurt School, though Hirschfeld's own claim that "racism" is rooted in fear, loss of self-esteem, and other social and psychological pathologies resembles the ideas the Frankfurt School was formulating.

Nor, despite Hirschfeld's own Jewish background and the Nazi threat to Jews, does he seem preoccupied with anti-Semitism; in one or two passages he criticizes Jews themselves for their own ethnocentrism and faults Zionism for having created a new "race hatred" between Jews and Arabs. Moreover, Hirschfeld is a stout defender of eugenics, though not on racial lines, and he even has a brief chapter exploring a distinction he calls "Gobinism or Galtonism"—that is, attacking the ideas of French "racist" Arthur de Gobineau and defending those of Francis Galton, who coined the word "eugenics" and pioneered its development. Today most critics of "racism" would lump Galton and Gobineau together rather than distinguish between them.

As a serious critique of the view that socially significant natural differences between the races exist, Hirschfeld's book is a failure, and even as a polemic against some of the more politicized and unverified claims about race made a century or more ago, it is weak. The importance of the book is not so much its content, however, as what it tells us about the word

"racism" and how the enemies of white racial consciousness have developed and deployed it for their own purposes.

Hirschfeld describes his own political ideals as "Pan-Humanism," a version of political, cultural, and racial universalism. The Pauls themselves write, "we think that the readers of *Racism* will detect a very definite orientation to the Left…. [Hirschfeld] was one who fully realized that sexual reform is impossible without a preliminary economic and political revolution."

In *Racism*, Hirschfeld offers what is essentially a definition of "Pan-Humanism": "The individual, however close the ties of neighborhood, companionship, family, a common lot, language, education, and the environment of nation and country, can find only one dependable unity within which to seek a permanent spiritual kinship—that of humanity-at-large, that of the whole human race." With one exception, he is unsparing in his denunciations of the ethnocentric loyalties of nations, races, and cultures: "Always and everywhere, except in Soviet Russia, xenophobia, xenophobia, xenophobia." Later, he informs us, "It may be too early to speak, but perhaps the problem of nationalities and races has already been solved on one-sixth of the land-surface of the globe [i.e., Stalin's Russia]."

"Racism," therefore, is a term originating on the left, and has been so defined and loaded with meanings the left wants it to have that it cannot now be used by the supporters of white racial consciousness for any constructive purpose. Anyone who uses the term to describe himself or his own views has already allowed himself to be maneuvered onto his opponents' ground and has already lost the debate. He may try to define the word differently, but he will need to spend most of his time explaining that he does not mean by it what everyone else means. As a term useful for communicating ideas that the serious supporters of white racial consciousness wish to communicate, the term is useless, and it was intended by those who developed it that it be useless for that purpose.

But understanding the origins of the word "racism" in Hirschfeld's polemic also makes clear the uselessness of the word for any other purpose. No one seems ever to have used the word to describe his own ideas or ideas with which he agrees; its only application has been by the enemies of the ideas it purports to describe, and hence it has no objective meaning apart from its polemical usage. If no one calls his own ideas "racism" and its only application is to a body of ideas considered to be untrue and evil, then it has

no use other than as a kind of fancy curse word, the purpose of which is simply to demonize anyone who expresses the ideas it is supposed to describe.

It is clear that Magnus Hirschfeld himself harbored deep ideological, professional, and personal animosities against those to whom he applied the word, and those animosities may have extended to the entire society that throughout his career he associated with sexual repression and which he wanted replaced by a kind of global communism under the label of "Pan-Humanism." Whatever the flaws or virtues of his polemic against "racism," his own opposition to racial consciousness was neither entirely rational nor disinterested. It is time that the enemies of racial, national, and cultural consciousness like Hirschfeld and the Frankfurt School cease to be able to claim a monopoly on rationality and sanity and that the obsessions and motivations that seem to shape their own ideologies and political behavior be subjected to the same scrutiny they apply to the societies and peoples whom their thinking could destroy.

*This article originally appeared in the May 1999 issue of* American Renaissance.

* * *

* * *

# The War on White Heritage

## The attack on the battle flag is only a preliminary skirmish.

*Francis was a Southerner, and was proud that his ancestors fought for the Confederacy. He was also a sharp critic of Union leaders. In his view, Abraham Lincoln not only waged a war of aggression against a sovereign nation, but in so doing strengthened the federal government immeasurably, thereby destroying the old republic of the founders, and laying the foundations for today's leviathan state.*

*Unlike some Confederate extremists, Francis never let his Southern sympathies interfere with the larger and more fundamental question of racial solidarity. However, his Southern identity was strong, and he was a frequent speaker at events sponsored by the Sons of Confederate Veterans.*

*In this essay he explains to Northern whites what current attacks on the Confederacy really are: the opening salvo in an assault on everything that is distinctively European.*

*

After years of bitter controversy, the South Carolina legislature voted in May to take down the Confederate battle flag that has flown over the state capitol in Columbia since 1962 and to move it to "a place of honor" at the South Carolina Monument located on the capitol grounds. The legislature's vote on the flag is regarded as a defeat for the defenders of the flag, mainly a coalition of Southern traditionalist groups and Civil War buffs, and a victory for the opposing coalition that demanded the removal of the flag: the NAACP, Big Business, and an odd partnership of political liberals and conservatives.

Many white Americans, especially those outside the South, have shown little interest in the controversy and wonder why it even exists. They regard

the issue as one of exclusively Southern, historical, or black interest and fail to see the larger implications of the controversy for themselves. The fact is, however, that the conflict over Confederate symbols is not only about those symbols or even about honoring the Confederacy, but also about issues of national and racial heritage with which all white Americans should be concerned regardless of what they think of the Civil War or where they live.

Southern traditionalists and Civil War buffs honor the Confederate flag and similar symbols for a variety of reasons, but those symbols are as much a part of general American history as the "Don't Tread On Me" rattlesnake flag of the American Revolution or the Lone Star flag of the Republic of Texas. Until recently, few Americans saw any difference between honoring and displaying those historic banners of American legend and honoring and displaying the Confederate battle flag or the several other flags associated with the Confederacy.

Only with the advent of the "civil rights" era and of mandated racial equality have the Confederate flag and all other symbols associated with the Confederacy been singled out for attack, and of course the reason is that these flags and symbols are the emblems of a government and culture that was based on slavery and racial inequality. In an age in which the egalitarian imperative is absolute and "racism" is virtually a religious taboo, continuing to honor and display these symbols in public—especially by state and local governments—constitutes an outright act of resistance to the dominant egalitarian orthodoxies.

Moreover, the NAACP, which has been crusading against Confederate symbols for decades, is increasingly tipping its true hand, revealing that behind its overblown rhetoric about the flag and the Confederacy (a 1991 NAACP resolution characterized the Confederate flag as "an odious blight upon the universe" and "the ugly symbol of idiotic white supremacy racism and denigration" [*sic*]) lies another, far broader, and much more radical agenda. The NAACP and similar groups want the removal and erasure not only of Confederate symbolism but also of a wide range of symbols and icons from American history that have no association with the Confederacy or the antebellum South. The purpose of this attack is to emphasize that American civilization itself is "racist" and that virtually all the symbols, icons, heroes, songs, and institutions of the American past or at least its most important and defining ones have to be discarded or radically reconstructed to suit the new "anti-racist" dogmas the NAACP upholds.

In launching this broad attack on the historic symbolism of America, the NAACP is embarking on what is almost explicitly a revolutionary course, intended eventually to lead to the destruction of the traditional civilization of the United States and the establishment of a new, purportedly egalitarian, and essentially totalitarian order that replaces the real, historic traditions of the American past with the fabricated propaganda and "Afro-centric" racial mythology of which the NAACP approves.

In this new order, whites—whether Southern or not—would be denied any public affirmation of their cultural and historical identity, and the denial of their identity would more easily allow their cultural and political subjugation to the non-white majority that has been projected to emerge in the United States in the next half century. The end result of the attack on Confederate symbolism, in other words, is not merely the disappearance of the Confederate flag, "Dixie," and other symbols and customs of interest mainly to Southerners and Civil War buffs but, in time, the eradication of all symbols from pre-1960s America that suggest a white-based or "Euro-centric" public identity. With their disappearance and the cultural and racial dispossession it represents would come the racial domination of white Americans by the non-white majority of the next century.

The crusade against Confederate symbolism is so far the most developed part of the anti-white attack on American civilization, and the NAACP and other black nationalist groups have emphasized such symbols because, given their historical association with slavery, they can more easily build a case against them and attract the support of white allies. Given the power of egalitarian propaganda, few mainstream leaders, either conservative or liberal, are willing to defend Confederate symbolism, and some of the most effective enemies of the flag have been Republicans, "conservatives," or white Southerners themselves.

In the 1990s, the war on public Confederate symbolism escalated dramatically, with the NAACP's demanding the removal of Confederate flags flown over state capitols in Alabama as well as South Carolina. In the former state, the governor removed the flag after a state judge ruled in 1993 that flying it violated state law. Also in 1993, the white liberal Democratic governor of Georgia, Zell Miller, sought to alter the design of his state's official flag, which contains a Confederate battle flag, on the grounds that it would be an "embarrassment" to the state during the Olympic Games scheduled for 1996. The governor's efforts were unsuccessful. In

Mississippi, there are current demands to remove the Confederate battle flag in the corner of the state flag, and the governor has appointed a commission to consider doing so. There are also controversies about the state flags of Arkansas and Florida, which contain designs either symbolizing the Confederacy or resembling its flag.

In addition to the flag, songs such as Virginia's state anthem "Carry Me Back to Ole Virginny" and Maryland's "Maryland, My Maryland" have also been attacked as "racist." At the University of Mississippi, the Confederate flag and similar symbols, including the football team mascot, "Colonel Reb," a caricature of a Confederate officer, have been banned by the university administration.

Virginia, and especially the state (and Confederate) capital of Richmond, have been the scene of some of the most bitter and far-reaching attacks on Confederate symbolism. The construction of a statue of black tennis player Arthur Ashe in 1995–96 on Richmond's Monument Avenue—famous for statues honoring Confederate leaders—was intended to disrupt the symbolism of the monuments. In 1999, another controversy erupted in Richmond over a mural that displayed a picture of Robert E. Lee. Black city councilman Sa'ad El-Amin demanded that it be removed and threatened violence if it were not. "Either it comes down or we jam," he said. The Lee portrait was later firebombed and defaced with anti-white invectives and racial epithets ("white devil, black baby killer, kill the white demons"). Earlier this year Mr. El-Amin and other blacks on the city council voted to remove the names of Confederate generals from two bridges in the city and rename them after local "civil rights" leaders. El-Amin also announced that "Monument Avenue is on my list of targets."

The NAACP also embarked on a campaign to force the Virginia governor to cancel annual proclamations of April as "Confederate History Month" and threatened a boycott of the state if the custom were continued. "Anything less" than promising not to issue the proclamation again "is unacceptable," Salim Khalfani, state director of the NAACP, proclaimed. On May 10, Republican Gov. James Gilmore reached a "compromise" that consisted of a promise to "reconsider" Confederate History Month and to meet regularly with NAACP leaders if they did not proceed with plans for a boycott. It is probable that proclamations of "Confederate History Month" will be discontinued. [Francis's predictions were correct. In 2002, Gov. Mark Warner declined to issue the traditional proclamation—Ed.]

It has been in South Carolina, however, that the most protracted controversies over the Confederate flag have taken place. The state legislature in 1961 enacted a public law mandating that the Confederate battle flag be flown over the state capitol dome beneath the American flag and the state flag. Contrary to what the flag's enemies have asserted, this was not so much defiance of the "civil rights" movement as the desire, encouraged by the U.S. Congress and President Eisenhower, to mark the centennial of the Civil War. The flag at that time was largely uncontroversial, and it remained so until the early 1990s.

In 1994, the NAACP announced it would boycott the state unless the flag were removed, but a populist campaign under the leadership of the Council of Conservative Citizens (CofCC) was able to prevent the flag's removal, and in the gubernatorial campaign of that year, the Republican candidate, David Beasley, promised he would not seek to take down the flag. Soon after being elected, however, Governor Beasley embarked on a campaign to do just that. Flag supporters and the CofCC went on to lead a movement to unseat the governor for his betrayal. Governor Beasley was defeated in his re-election campaign in 1998; he has since acknowledged that his reversal of position on the flag was the main reason for his defeat.

In 1999 the NAACP returned to the fight, announcing yet another boycott. This time the boycott attracted the support of liberal organs such as the *New York Times* and *Washington Post*. The Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Urban League, the African Methodist Episcopal Church, and the National Progressive Baptist Convention all canceled conventions in South Carolina. The state Chamber of Commerce told Republican lawmakers that "businesses were considering cutting off campaign contributions to lawmakers who support the flag," and major foreign corporations that have built plants in the state—BMW and Michelin Tire—also demanded that the issue be "resolved quickly" (meaning that the legislators accede to black demands).

Flag defenders were by no means idle during the controversy, and in October 1999 and January 2000 they staged mass demonstrations in Columbia. Nevertheless, the charges of "racism" lobbed at anyone who defended the flag, threats to the $14.5 billion-a-year tourism industry, and the general desire for acceptance by the cultural mainstream all led to a "compromise" measure that relocated the flag to the South Carolina

Monument. As Julian Bond, national president of the NAACP, remarked, "Money talks."

But the removal of the flag in South Carolina can be expected only to unleash an even more frenetic crusade against Confederate symbols. As Dr. Neill Payne, executive director of the Southern Legal Resource Center, remarked just afterwards, the vote simply means that it is now "open season on all things Confederate." Flag enemy Georgia state Rep. Tyrone Brooks explained, "It's like the civil rights movement. Once we win in South Carolina, we move to Georgia. Once we win in Georgia, it's on to Mississippi." The vote in South Carolina only encourages the NAACP and its allies and creates further problems for the mainstream conservatives and businessmen whose principal concern is to avoid controversy.

Indeed, while the main reason for the retreat in South Carolina was fear of the boycott, the NAACP not only refused to call off the boycott after the vote but threatened to intensify it unless the flag were removed from the capitol grounds entirely. NAACP national executive director Kweisi Mfume complained that "to take it from the top of the dome where you had to strain to see it, and move it to a place where anyone coming down the main street will see it is an insult." Even as the House voted to adopt the compromise measure, black demonstrators burned Confederate and Nazi flags at the South Carolina Monument and then sprayed anti-white invectives on the monument itself.

The premise of the compromise was an acknowledgment that while the Confederacy is an important and legitimate part of the South Carolina heritage, it is not (as flying the Confederate flag over the capitol might be taken to imply) the whole or the dominant part of it. Yet the NAACP's demand that any honoring of the flag be abolished refuses to concede that the Confederacy has any legitimate place in South Carolina or American history at all. The rejection of the Southern and American past was implicit in signs carried by black anti-flag demonstrators last winter that read, "Your Heritage Is Our Slavery." In rejecting the heritage of the South as merely one of their own enslavement and exploitation, blacks are in effect affirming that they are not part of the culture and nation that are the present-day product of that heritage. What they presumably want celebrated and honored is not the real heritage of the South, in which blacks played a major if subordinate role and from which blacks have derived much of their own cultural identity, but the total extirpation of those parts of the Southern past

they find “offensive” (i.e., anything that does not glorify blacks) and the rewriting of the past to magnify and glorify the achievements of their own race.

The black demand for the total extirpation or rewriting of the past is not confined to the South and the Confederacy, however, but also extends to symbols associated with other ethnic groups. Earlier this year the Boston Housing Authority asked residents of public housing to remove displays of shamrocks—which it likened to swastikas or Confederate flags—because this symbol traditionally associated with the Irish was “unwelcome” now that black residents vastly outnumber those of Irish heritage.

But the non-white demand for the erasure of white ethnic and cultural symbols also includes the major symbols of the entire American nation and its past. Indeed, Randall Robinson, a black activist who played an important role in lobbying for sanctions against South Africa to end apartheid, writes that America “must dramatically reconfigure its symbolized picture of itself, to itself. Its national parks, museums, monuments, statues, artworks must be recast in a way to include … African-Americans.” It does not seem to matter to Mr. Robinson that the historical events many of these cultural monuments commemorate might not have included blacks; the past must be recreated to include them.

Black rejection of not only the Confederate but the American heritage is clear in the removal of the name of George Washington from a public school in New Orleans. On Oct. 27, 1997, the Orleans Parish School Board, with a 5–2 black majority, voted to change the name of George Washington Elementary to Dr. Charles Richard Drew Elementary (Drew was a black surgeon who made advances in preserving blood plasma); the school itself is 91 percent black. “Why should African-Americans want their kids to pay respect or pay homage to someone who enslaved their ancestors?” asked New Orleans “civil rights” leader Carl Galmon. “To African-Americans, George Washington has about as much meaning as David Duke.”

The same school board also has stripped the names of Confederate generals P.G.T. Beauregard and Robert E. Lee from schools, under a policy adopted in 1992 that prohibits naming schools after “former slave owners or others who did not respect equal opportunity for all.” Southern slave owners and Confederate generals are, of course, mainly of Southern and local interest, but George Washington is probably the most significant national symbol in the American pantheon. The New Orleans school board

decision, the *New York Times* commented at the time, "underscores the maxim that history is written by those with the power." In this case, those who have the power are blacks who insist on celebrating their own race and discarding the national heroes of whites.

But Washington is by no means the only American icon to be rejected for his "racism." In 1996, white former Marxist historian Conor Cruise O'Brien published an article in *The Atlantic Monthly* arguing that Thomas Jefferson should no longer be included in the national pantheon because of his "racism." Again, Jefferson, second only to Washington perhaps, is one of the major heroes of the national saga. Rejecting Washington and Jefferson as well as the Confederacy and all slave owners (including many who signed the Declaration and the Constitution and all but two of the first seven presidents of the United States) by itself would effectively alter American history and the American national identity so radically as to be unrecognizable. That is precisely what the Afro-racists plan to do.

The editor of *Ebony* magazine, Lerone Bennett, Jr., is the author of a recent book denouncing Abraham Lincoln for his "racism." As described in *Time* magazine of May 15, 2000, Mr. Bennett says, "Lincoln was a crude bigot who habitually used the N word and had an unquenchable thirst for blackface-minstrel shows and demeaning 'darky' jokes," and he also discusses Lincoln's remarks about blacks in the debates with Stephen Douglas and on other occasions, as well as his plan to remove blacks from the United States to colonies in Central America. While Bennett's facts about Lincoln are substantially correct, his book is intended as an attack on and debunking of a major president regarded by many Americans as an iconic figure especially associated with the abolition of slavery and the triumph of egalitarianism.

In February, the New Jersey senate debated a bill that would have required students in public schools to memorize part of the Declaration, but the bill's sponsor withdrew it after angry attacks by black lawmakers. As the Associated Press reported, "They objected to the clause that says, 'All men are created equal' because when the Declaration was written, that basic democratic principle did not apply to black people." As black state Sen. Wayne Bryant said, "It is clear that African Americans were not included in that phrase. It's another way of being exclusionary and insensitive…. You have nerve to ask my grandchildren to recite [the Declaration]. How dare

you? You are now on notice that this is offensive to my community." He claimed that the bill would involve "reliving slavery."

The assault on the historic American identity is not mounted only by blacks. Indians and Hispanics in the western part of the United States engage in much the same erasure of white, European symbols and the construction of symbols that glamorize their own cultures. In 1994, the city of San Jose, California, rejected a proposal to construct a public statue of Col. Thomas Fallon, the American soldier who captured the city for the United States in the Mexican-American War, and voted instead to build a statue of the Aztec god Quetzalcoatl.

In San Francisco in 1996, American Indians denounced the relocation to a place outside city hall of a statue honoring the Catholic missionaries who founded the city. The statue shows a reclining Indian with a Franciscan monk standing over him. The American Indian Movement Confederation opposed its relocation, saying that the statue "symbolizes the humiliation, degradation, genocide, and sorrow inflicted upon this country's indigenous people by a foreign invader, through religious persecution and ethnic prejudice." As in South Carolina, whites compromised—by adding a plaque that read, "With their efforts over in 1834, the missionaries left behind about 56,000 converts—and 150,000 dead. Half the original Native American population had perished during this time from disease, armed attacks, and mistreatment." The statue, designed to commemorate the missionaries' compassion for the Indians, had been transformed into a confession of genocide. At the demand of the Catholic Church, however, the words "and 150,000 dead" were omitted.

The black and other non-white attacks on historic symbols and icons, therefore, are by no means confined to those associated with the Confederacy but extend to symbols associated with anything non-whites find "offensive." Given the standards by which the NAACP and similar racial extremists select their targets, there is no reason they should not demand the abolition of the American flag and the U.S. Constitution itself. The Constitution indirectly refers and gives protection to slavery several times, and the American flag flew over a nation in which slavery was a legal and important part of the economy and society far longer than the Confederate flag flew over the four-year Confederacy.

Indeed, the factual premises of the NAACP—that American history is inseparable from recognition of racial inequality and racial differences—are

generally correct (see "Race and the American Identity," p. 57). White Americans traditionally thought of themselves as the numerically and culturally dominant group, and established systems and institutions to perpetuate that dominance. Given this history, there is virtually no figure, event, or institution of the American past that would not be "offensive" to non-whites today and the obliteration of which they could not as logically demand as they do that of Confederate symbols.

To reject race is to reject America as it has really existed throughout its history, and whatever is meant by "America" must come from something other than its real past. This is exactly what the NAACP and other non-white racial extremists want, and it is their rejection of the real past of the United States that makes them extremists. It does not seem to occur to them that there are other "heritages" in the United States besides their own or other communities to which such symbols as Washington and Jefferson, the Declaration and the Confederacy, mean something other than the enslavement and exploitation of blacks.

The indifference and hostility of non-whites to symbols and icons of white heritage and identity expose the central fallacy of the "multi-racialism" that our current political and cultural elites promote. Its premise is that different races and ethnic groups can all "get along" with each other, that they can live together in egalitarian harmony, and that, as President Clinton said in 1998, "we can strengthen the bonds of our national community as we grow more racially and ethnically diverse."

But the reality is that the egalitarianism and universalism of the "civil rights" era have led to the rediscovery of race and the rebirth of racial consciousness among non-whites and hence to the animosity that non-whites feel toward whites and their heritage. It is racial consciousness, not egalitarianism and universalism, that fuels the non-white crusade against the American past, and obviously, if "multi-racialism" means that some races with more consciousness, more solidarity, and more power can boycott and bludgeon out of existence the symbols of other races and the cultural legacies the symbols represent, then multi-racialism promises nothing but either perpetual racial conflict or merely the same kind of racial supremacy that used to exist in the United States—though with a different supreme race, whose rule would be perhaps considerably more draconian than that of whites. Of course, whites can always try to buy temporary peace and harmony by agreeing to every demand of non-white radicalism

and abandoning the symbols of their own heritage. That, of course, is exactly what whites today are doing, though every concession merely leads to further demands.

It may be that the coalition of Southern traditionalists and Civil War buffs who have been the main defenders of the Confederate flag has committed a tactical error by trying to define the flag as purely a Southern symbol. By doing so, they may have encouraged white Americans outside the South and white Southerners who are indifferent to the Confederacy to believe that the controversy does not have implications for them. Indeed, some of the more zealous attacks on "Yankees" by Southern traditionalists may only have alienated non-Southern whites, and by dwelling on the "Southernness" of the flag and its meaning in the Civil War, its defenders may have unnecessarily alienated potential allies.

What the racial assault on the Confederacy and other non-Confederate symbols really shows, however, is not only the dangerous flaws of multi-racialism and the inexorable logic of the racial revolution of this century but also that today regional differences among whites—like many other cultural and political differences—are no longer very relevant. It shows that Southerners and "Yankees" today face common enemies and common threats to their rights, interests, identity, and heritage *as whites*, and that the forces that have declared war on them and their heritage define themselves as well as their foes, not in political, regional, or cultural terms but in terms of race. Whites who have been indifferent to the fate of the Confederate flag and similar symbols in the recent controversies should not be surprised, therefore, when historical symbols important to their own identity come under assault from anti-white radicals in the future.

And it is as a race that whites must now learn to resist the war being waged on them. So far from being a symbol of a lost and forgotten cause relevant only to a dwindling band of Confederate loyalists, the Confederate flag and the battles swirling around it today should serve as reminders to all white men and women of a simple lesson: Unless they forsake the many obsolete quarrels and controversies that have long divided them and learn to stand, work, and fight together for their own survival as a people and a civilization, the war against them that their self-proclaimed racial enemies are waging will not permit them or their legacy as a people and civilization to survive at all.

*This article originally appeared in the July 2000 issue of* American Renaissance.

* * *

* * *

# Ethnopolitics: Ethnic and Racial Implications of the 2000 Election

*Although far better known as a columnist and essayist, Francis was also a keen political commentator. His understanding of race, in combination with his extensive knowledge of history and politics, gave him a perspective that was unmatched in political journalism. It would be impossible to find a more comprehensive racial analysis of a presidential election than this selection, which first published in the* Social Contract.

*

In a controversial article in *National Review* in 1997, immigration expert Peter Brimelow and Ed Rubenstein predicted that the Republican Party was facing imminent political catastrophe due to the continuing tide of immigrants into the country and into the Democratic Party. Acknowledging that "Hispanics do indeed move rightward the longer they remain in America," the authors also contended that "this effect is canceled out by newly arrived immigrants who overwhelmingly vote Democratic. Hence, directly because of immigration the GOP has never approached a majority of the Hispanic vote. And this shows no sign of changing any time soon."

Even if the Republicans could maintain their 1988 level of support from each ethnic group in the American electorate (and they failed to do so in 1996), "they have at most two presidential cycles left. Then they go inexorably into minority status, beginning in 2008."

At first glance the results of the 2000 presidential election would seem to prove the Brimelow-Rubenstein thesis wrong. George W. Bush not only won the presidential election but did so after making concerted appeals to both black and Hispanic voters who have traditionally supported the Democrats. Mr. Bush is himself fluent in Spanish and used his language skills as well as those of his brother, Gov. Jeb Bush of Florida and his Hispanic family, to campaign in Hispanic areas. As governor of Texas, George W. Bush had won strong support from Hispanic voters in that state

in his own 1998 re-election campaign, and one of his attractions to Republicans in 2000 was his supposed ability to cut into the habitually Democratic Hispanic bloc.

Nevertheless, closer examination of the returns in the 2000 election does not contradict the Brimelow-Rubenstein thesis of 1997, and much appears to support it. Moreover, despite intensive rhetoric from both political parties about "racial reconciliation," the advantages of "diversity" that mass immigration supposedly brings, and the "end of racism," the truth appears to be that racial and ethnic solidarity is stronger than ever and will continue to shape American politics well into the future. The implication of these facts is clear: Immigration (along with an intensification of African-American racial solidarity in political behavior) has not served to unite the nation but to fragment it along ethnic and racial lines and to push the political spectrum toward the political left.

Exit polls from the Voter News Service (VNS) conducted on election day, November 7, 2000, reveal the ethnic and racial patterns of the vote. Perhaps the most striking ethnic pattern to emerge from the election is the overwhelming support for Democratic candidate Vice President Al Gore from black voters. VNS exit polls show that black voters, making up some 10 percent of the national electorate, supported Mr. Gore by 90 percent. While black male voters supported Mr. Gore by 85 percent, the Democratic candidate's support among black female voters was even larger—a huge 94 percent.

Nationally, about 19 percent—nearly one in five—of Mr. Gore's votes came from black voters. The level of black support for the Republican presidential candidate, however, was strikingly low; only 8 percent of black voters cast their ballots for George W. Bush. Black male voters went for Mr. Bush by 12 percent, but black female voters supported him by only 6 percent. Black support for the GOP ticket in 2000 was lower than in any other presidential election year since 1964, when Republican nominee Sen. Barry Goldwater, who had opposed civil rights legislation in the Senate, won only 6 percent of the black vote. By contrast, Ronald Reagan in 1984 won 9 percent of the black vote.

Mr. Bush's meager results were not from lack of trying. As black conservative commentator Armstrong Williams wrote after the election, "Governor Bush pursued African-American connections with more avidity than any Republican candidate of recent memory. He studded his campaign

trail with stops at inner-city schools, churches, welfare offices, and black communities. He filled his commercials with minority faces in an attempt to tell minority voters they were part of his party. He prominently kissed a black baby and could often be seen mingling with Hispanics." Why then did Mr. Bush not win more black votes?

One of the main reasons seems to be that his Democratic opponents and their supporters, the NAACP, mounted a concerted campaign to depict Mr. Bush as racially insensitive and an opponent of black political goals. Mr. Gore himself repeatedly denounced Mr. Bush's campaign pledge to appoint "strict constructionist" judges as a covert commitment to restore segregation and Jim Crow laws. Matthew Rees of the *Weekly Standard* noted a television ad sponsored by the NAACP that used the voice of the daughter of black murder victim James Byrd Jr., slain in Texas in 1998 by whites for apparently racial reasons, that "all but blamed Mr. Bush for her father's death at the hands of white racists." This and similar NAACP-sponsored ads on TV and radio accused Mr. Bush of indifference to "hate crimes," opposing new hate-crimes legislation for Texas in the wake of the Byrd killing, and opposing federal legislation against "racial profiling;" most of these ads strongly insinuated that Mr. Bush's positions were driven by racial bigotry. The NAACP in 2000 spent some $12 million through its National Voter Fund in a campaign to register black voters and get them to the polls.

Yet, while pro-Democratic ads nakedly appealed to racial solidarity in a negative way, the kind of appeals to black voters sponsored by Republicans were no less racial in a positive way. Filling TV ads with minority faces and kissing black babies are no less appeals to win votes on the basis of race than insinuating that an opponent is a racial bigot.

The black support for Mr. Gore was aided also by a sizeable black voter turnout on election day in critical swing states. While the national level of black voter turnout remained about the same in 2000 as in 1996 (about 10 percent), "black turnout increased more dramatically in states targeted by the NAACP, labor unions, and the Democratic Party," the *Washington Post* reported. The *Wall Street Journal* reported that in Florida, "[black] turnout surged by 50 percent from four years ago, giving blacks clout beyond their share of the voting-age population here," and DeWayne Wickham in *USA Today* attributed the forced vote recount in Florida to the massive black support for Mr. Gore (93 percent) in that state. Some 29 percent of Mr.

Gore's votes in Florida came from black voters. Political scientist David Bositis told the *Journal* that "black voter turnout appears to be a significant factor this year. In Michigan, Delaware, Florida, and Pennsylvania, black-voter turnout was absolutely critical" to Mr. Gore's final vote counts. In Missouri, the black share of the total vote grew from 5 percent in 1996 to 12 percent last year, helping to defeat incumbent Republican Sen. John Ashcroft and elect the deceased Gov. Mel Carnahan to the U.S. Senate. (Carnahan died in a plane crash just three weeks before the election and, according to Missouri election law, could not be removed from the ballot. Lt. Gov. Roger Wilson, who immediately succeeded as governor, promised to appoint Carnahan's widow to fill the vacant seat if Carnahan won the election, and for the first time a dead man was elected to the U.S. Senate. Governor Wilson duly appointed Mrs. Jean Carnahan to take his place.) In Tennessee, black turnout increased from 13 percent in 1996 to 18 percent in 2000.

If black voter support for Mr. Gore was overwhelming, so too was Hispanic support, though at lower levels. While black voters went for Mr. Gore by 90 percent, Hispanic voters, who make up some 7 percent of the electorate nationally, supported the Democrat by 67 percent—a level that is usually considered a landslide. Hispanic voters went for George W. Bush by only 31 percent, though Republican propagandists were quick to boast that this was a significant gain for their party over the miserably low 21 percent of the national Hispanic vote won by Republican presidential candidate Bob Dole in 1996.

The level of Hispanic support for the Republican ticket is important because of its implications for the immigration policies that the GOP supports. In 1994, California Gov. Pete Wilson won re-election (and indeed political resurrection) by endorsing the state's ballot initiative, Proposition 187, which terminated and prohibited all publicly funded services for illegal aliens. Although actually a budget proposal, Prop. 187 was widely viewed as an immigration measure and attracted both enemies and supporters because of that interpretation. The measure passed by some 65 percent and served for a while to put immigration issues on the national political agenda.

But because of Bob Dole's poor showing among Hispanics in 1996, supporters of liberal immigration policies such as Linda Chavez and Paul Gigot of the *Wall Street Journal* argued that Republican support for Prop.

187 and subsequent restrictions on immigration had served only to alienate the growing Hispanic vote, and that only by abandoning immigration restriction and courting Hispanic voters could Republicans expect to win in the future. In the years between 1996 and 2000, their advice was largely adopted by the Republican Party at the national level and in many states, including California. The Bush campaign in 2000 sought to attract Hispanic voters just as much as it sought to win black voters. It was only marginally more successful in doing so.

Indeed, a state-by-state analysis of the Hispanic vote for the GOP ticket in 2000 conducted by United Press International reporter Steven Sailer soon after the election shows very little improvement in the Republican showing due to Mr. Bush's personal appeals, strategy, or immigration policies. In California, for example, which has the largest number of Hispanic voters of any state and where Hispanics constitute 13.4 percent of the state electorate, Mr. Bush lost the Hispanic vote to Mr. Gore by an overwhelmingly larger margin than he lost it nationally—28 percent to Mr. Gore's 67 percent (the *Orange County Register* a week after the election reported that Mr. Bush won only 21 percent of the state's Hispanics). In 1996, according to the *Almanac of American Politics, 2000*, Bob Dole won only 20 percent of the Hispanic vote in California to Bill Clinton's 71 percent, so Mr. Bush's showing was not a significant gain.

Indeed, the whole argument that Republican and conservative support for Prop. 187 and immigration control generally alienated Hispanic voters from the GOP is open to question. In the first place, while strong Republican candidates such as Nixon and Reagan could win 30 percent to 35 percent of the Hispanic vote nationally, weaker candidates such as Gerald Ford in 1976 and George H.W. Bush in 1992 were able to win only smaller shares—and this was well before Prop. 187 came along. Mr. Ford in 1976 won only 24 percent and Mr. Bush in 1992 won only 25 percent of the national Hispanic vote. Mr. Dole's 21 percent in 1996 (and 20 percent in California) is consistent with the performance of a weak Republican candidate among Hispanic voters. Moreover, Mr. Dole himself publicly repudiated the Republican Party's platform plank calling for immigration control (drafted by Pat Buchanan forces at the GOP convention) and chose as his running mate the militantly pro-immigration neo-conservative Jack Kemp, who had actively opposed Proposition 187 in 1994. Mr. Dole himself had no visible record on immigration issues. Whatever Pete Wilson

and California Republicans might have said or done to alienate Hispanic voters in 1994 did not apply to Mr. Dole and Mr. Kemp in 1996 (or to low Hispanic support for George W. Bush outside of California in 2000). In any case, 23 percent of Hispanic voters in California voted for Prop. 187, suggesting that about a quarter of the Hispanic vote in the state is essentially conservative and Republican and is what Republican candidates should normally expect to receive in that state.

Mr. Bush's gain in Hispanic votes in 2000 over Mr. Dole in 1996 was therefore not due to any significantly greater success among California Hispanics than Mr. Dole's. The same is true in two other major regions of concentrated Hispanic voting power, New York and Texas. In the former, which contains the third-largest concentration of Hispanic voters (8.2 percent of the state electorate) in the nation, Mr. Bush lost Hispanic support even more dramatically, carrying only 18 percent of the state's Hispanic (largely Puerto Rican) voters to Mr. Gore's 80 percent. (Hillary Clinton in her successful race for the U.S. Senate seat from New York won 85 percent of Hispanic votes.) In Texas, Mr. Bush's home state where he had (according to pro-Republican propaganda) carried a majority of Hispanic voters in his re-election campaign in 1998 (the real figure was only 39 percent), Mr. Bush did better but still failed to win a majority of Hispanic voters. Texas contains the nation's second-largest concentration of Hispanic voters (19.6 percent), and Mr. Bush won only 42 percent of them—admittedly a gain over his 1998 performance and considerably better than most Texas Republicans, but still considerably less than the Hispanic majority of 54 percent carried by Mr. Gore.

Only in Florida, where Hispanics constitute 11.9 percent of the state electorate and make up the nation's fourth-largest concentration of Hispanic voters, was Mr. Bush able to win a slim majority of 50 percent to Mr. Gore's 48 percent. It must be remembered that Mr. Bush's brother Jeb Bush is the governor of Florida, that his wife and children are visibly Hispanic, and that they campaigned strongly for Mr. Bush in the state.

But the Florida Hispanic vote is largely Cuban in extraction, and Cuban voters have historically voted Republican. Democratic presidential candidates have traditionally received only 13 percent to 15 percent of the Florida Cuban vote, though in 1996 Bill Clinton actually won 27 percent of the Cubans. In the post-Cold War political environment, the anti-Castro

sentiment that drove Cubans into GOP ranks may be dwindling as a major motive of voting behavior.

Nevertheless, the major reason for Mr. Bush's win among Hispanics in Florida last year, in most experts' views, was the Clinton administration's alienation of the Cuban constituency by its support for returning Elian Gonzalez to Cuba earlier in the year. As Fox News's Malcolm Balfour reported, one local voter of Cuban background told him a few days after the vote:

> I know hundreds of people who registered to vote just because of that raid on Elian's relatives' home. Last time, I voted for the Democrat, Bill Clinton, but no way would I vote Democrat this time around. That was a Democratic conspiracy to carry out an illegal raid just when the parties were reaching an agreement. The Democratic Party violated the civil rights of Cuban-Americans everywhere.

Two days before the election, the *St. Petersburg Times* reported that "as Election Day nears Cuban-American exiles are getting ready to exact their revenge [for Clinton's policy toward the Gonzalez boy]. Al Gore seems set to pay the price for the Clinton administration's efforts to let the boy go back to Cuba with his dad," even though Mr. Gore himself expressed disagreement with the administration's policy.

Mr. Bush also did poorly among Hispanic voters in Western and Southwestern states. In Arizona, where Hispanics are 13.6 percent of the electorate, Mr. Gore won Hispanics by 65 percent to Mr. Bush's 33 percent. In New Mexico, where more than one-third (34.9 percent) of the electorate is Hispanic, Mr. Gore won 66 percent among Hispanics to Mr. Bush's 32 percent. In Colorado, where Hispanics compose 8 percent of the electorate, Hispanics voted for Mr. Gore 68 percent over Mr. Bush, 25 percent.

Yet throughout the campaign, Mr. Bush repeatedly expressed support for more immigration from Latin America, praised its results, and distanced himself from immigration restriction and control. Thus, in an interview with the *Cedar Rapids Gazette* on January 6, 2000, Mr. Bush said, "We ought to increase legal immigration for our country's advantage. The high-tech world we are now dominating is dependent on educated folks, but we're short of workers." Last August, Mr. Bush described his view of the effects

of immigration on American society in these glowing terms in a speech to a Hispanic audience in Miami:

> America has one national creed, but many accents. We are now one of the largest Spanish-speaking nations in the world. We're a major source of Latin music, journalism, and culture.
>
> Just go to Miami, or San Antonio, Los Angeles, Chicago, or West New York, New Jersey, and close your eyes and listen. You could just as easily be in Santo Domingo or Santiago, or San Miguel de Allende.
>
> For years our nation has debated this change—some have praised it and others have resented it. By nominating me, my party has made a choice to welcome the new America.

Mr. Bush often campaigned in Spanish and made heavy use of his half-Mexican nephew, George P. Bush, in his campaign appeals to Hispanic voters. Mr. Bush's supporters in the conservative press, such as the *Washington Times*'s Donald Lambro, confidently prophesied his capture of a majority of Hispanic voters. Thus, on December 20, 1999, Mr. Lambro wrote in the *Times* that "George W. Bush is winning support from a majority of Hispanic voters" and cited "Hispanic officials and grass-roots activists" who said Mr. Bush's support among Hispanics was "the result of Mr. Bush's efforts to reach out to Hispanics with a message of inclusiveness and with tax-cut proposals that appeal to business owners and families with children." Of course, as many critics of Mr. Bush's approach to Hispanics predicted, Hispanic ethnic loyalties in the end proved far more powerful than tax cuts as motivations for voting behavior.

The conclusion is unavoidable: Mr. Bush's elaborate appeals to Hispanics on the basis of abandoning immigration restriction and courting Hispanics at the GOP convention and in the campaign were a failure. He gained Hispanic votes at all only because of his own connections with Hispanic voters in his home state of Texas and because of blunders by the Democrats among Hispanics in Florida.

Indeed, Hispanic solidarity with the Democrats should not be surprising. As a report in the *Boston Globe* pointed out shortly before the election, "More than 1.7 million resident aliens have become U.S. citizens in the past two years, most of them with an incentive to vote and a lopsided preference for the Democratic Party." The story quoted one California Democratic

activist as saying, “Both parties show up at swearing-in ceremonies to try to register voters. There is a Democratic table and a Republican table. Ours has a lot of business. Theirs is like the Maytag repairman.” In January 2001, the London *Financial Times*, reporting on the transformation of California state politics by the Hispanic presence there, noted that the demographic shift in the state is “moulding the foundations of a one-party state” for the Democrats. “Fresh data,” the *Financial Times* reported, “show a continuing shift of Latin and Asian voters into the Democrat camp.” The prospects for the Republicans in the state are thus no better in the future than they have been in the past.

Similar solidarity among other ethnic groups was also apparent during the 2000 election, with Jews voting 79 percent for the Gore-Lieberman ticket (Jewish voters traditionally cast about a third of their support to the Republican nominee, but in 1992, 1996, and last year’s elections the Republican candidates won only 11 percent, 16 percent, and 19 percent of the Jewish vote respectively). Similarly, Asian voters went for Mr. Gore by a strong (though not overwhelming) 54 percent; in 1992, 55 percent of Asian voters supported George H.W. Bush and in 1996 48 percent supported Dole and only 44 percent Clinton. These figures show a steady trend among Asian voters toward the political left during the last decade. Reportedly, about 70 percent of American Indians and about 60 percent of Arab-Americans also voted for Mr. Gore last year.

The only ethnic group that can be said to have supported the Republicans is whites, though by no means as solidly as most non-white blocs support the Democrats. In 2000, white men, who compose 39 percent of the electorate, voted for George W. Bush over Al Gore by 60 percent to 35 percent. White women, who make up 43 percent of the electorate, were much more evenly split, with 49 percent voting for Mr. Bush and 48 percent voting for Mr. Gore. White voters in general, who compose 82 percent of the electorate, voted for Mr. Bush over Mr. Gore by 54 percent to 42 percent. Table 1 shows the historic pattern of white voting since 1972.

Table 1. Voting by Whites, 1972–2000
(* indicates winner)

1972 — Nixon (R)* 67%
McGovern (D) 31%

1976 — Ford (R) 52%
Carter (D)* 47%

1980 — Reagan (R)* 56%
Carter (D) 36%
Anderson (3rd) 7%

1984 — Reagan (R)* 64%
Mondale (D) 35%

1988 — G.H.W. Bush (R)* 59%
Dukakis (D) 40%

1992 — G.H.W. Bush (R) 40%
Clinton (D)* 39%
Perot (3rd) 20%

1996 — Dole (R) 46%
Clinton (D)* 43%
Perot (3rd) 9%

2000 — G.W. Bush (R)* 54%
Gore (D) 42%
Nader (3rd) 3%

The table shows that while a majority of white voters usually vote for the Republican candidate, only twice in the eight presidential elections since 1972—in that year and in 1984—have they voted together by more than 60 percent and only four times have more than 55 percent of whites voted together for a single candidate. Compare this level of bloc voting to that of blacks (always 80–90 percent) or Hispanics (always 60–75 percent), and it is clear that of the three major racial/ethnic groups in the United States, whites vote less as a bloc than the two others.

It will also be noticed that the percentage of whites who support the Democrats does not change significantly from year to year. Although George W. Bush won a strong majority of 54 percent of white voters last year, Mr. Gore did better than most Democratic candidates in the recent past by winning 42 percent. The 42–43 percent of white votes that Mr. Gore and Clinton won in 1996 and 2000 respectively is more than any Democratic presidential candidate has won since Jimmy Carter in 1976. Correspondingly, Mr. Bush's 54 percent majority last year, while better than

what Bob Dole and Mr. Bush's father won in their races in the 1990s, is a distinct decline from the nearly 60 percent average won by Republican nominees in the 1970s and 1980s.

One major reason for the improvement of the Democratic ticket in winning white votes and the decline in white votes for the Republican ticket in 2000 is the change in the political strategies of the two parties in recent years. The Republicans have deliberately neglected their natural political base among white voters in a fruitless pursuit of non-white voters, while the Democrats have not hesitated to appeal to at least key sectors of the white vote even as they also appealed to non-white and anti-white racial anxieties to mobilize non-white support.

Recent Republican strategy reflects a deliberate decision on the part of party leaders to abandon both the issues and the strategy—and presumably the constituencies that the strategy won—that brought landslide victories to such Republican leaders as Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan. Recent Republican strategy also reflects the growing belief that winning non-white votes is essential to the Republican future. Whereas strong Republican candidates such as Nixon and Reagan in the 1970s and 1980s relied on what came to be known as the "Southern strategy" to win high levels of support among white voters, the new Republicans of the 1990s explicitly rejected and abandoned that strategy.

Thus, GOP pollster Lance Tarrance told the *Washington Times* in January 2000:

> We have now moved from the Southern strategy we pursued for the last three decades, since Richard Nixon, to a Hispanic strategy for the next three decades. The maturing of the Hispanic vote is in the very states that have allowed the Republican Party to develop its first majority in the last half century.

Similarly, Jim Nicholson, chairman of the Republican National Committee, told the *Times*, "This party is going after the growing Hispanic vote with TV ads, Hispanic candidate-recruitment attempts, campaigns conducted by Spanish-speaking Republicans in Latino communities, and an all-out effort to persuade newly naturalized citizens of Hispanic origin to join the Republican Party." In 1999, Republican state Sen. Jim Brulte of California explicitly vowed that he would no longer support financial

contributions to white, male candidates. “My leadership PAC will give no more money to Anglo males in Republican primaries,” Senator Brulte said. “Every dollar I can raise is going to nominate Latinos and Asian Americans and women. We have to expand our outreach.”

In August 2000, the *Washington Post* cited Karl Rove, Mr. Bush’s top political strategist, as dismissing the Southern strategy as an “old paradigm” that “past GOP candidates had employed in a calculated bid to polarize the electorate and put together a predominantly white majority. People are more attracted today by a positive agenda than by wedge issues.” Ralph Reed, the former executive director of the Christian Coalition and now a Republican political consultant, also told the *Post*, “This is a very different party from the party that sits down on Labor Day and cedes the black vote and cedes the Hispanic vote, and tries to drive its percentage of the white vote over 70 percent to win an election.” As indicated earlier, George W. Bush himself reflected this new strategy in his own campaign rhetoric and positions on immigration.

But the actual result of this new strategy is evident from the exit polls of the 2000 election. The strategy failed to attract significant numbers of non-white voters; it failed miserably to win black votes and won only enough Hispanic votes to raise Hispanic support to not quite the traditional level of Hispanic support for the Republican ticket. More significantly, it also failed to attract the large numbers of white voters who are the natural base of the party and who remain essential for the kind of clear-cut, landslide electoral victories won by Nixon and Reagan. Mr. Bush was able to win a small majority of white voters, but without the kind of explicit appeals to them that Nixon and Reagan made, he and his party are unable to win larger majorities. Experts such as Mr. Reed and Mr. Rove are entirely correct that today’s GOP is a different party from the old one of Nixon and Reagan. The old party could win landslide victories through the Southern strategy and appeals to white voters. The new party built by Mr. Reed, Mr. Rove, and Mr. Bush can barely win elections at all, and managed to lose the popular vote to its opponent. (Mr. Bush lost the popular vote to Mr. Gore, and certainly would have lost the electoral vote as well had Ralph Nader not run as a third-party candidate of the left and taken votes from Mr. Gore.)

The Democrats under Al Gore, by contrast, made every effort to cut into the Republicans’ white political base. They did so by deploying what during the campaign was called the “class war” strategy, denouncing Big Business

(Big Oil, Big Tobacco, Big Drug companies), vowing free prescription drugs and health care for the elderly, and appealing to white union members. *Washington Post* political reporter Thomas Edsall noted this strategy during the campaign:

> Gore's success in making inroads with working-class voters, especially white men, has been crucial to his improved standing in the battleground states of Michigan, Ohio, and Missouri that hold the balance of power in the 2000 election. Among all voters in each of these states, Democrat Gore is either fully competitive with, or slightly ahead of Texas Gov. Bush, the Republican nominee.

Although Mr. Gore lost in two of these states, the strength of his challenge to Mr. Bush in them forced his rival to divert resources and attention he might have deployed elsewhere.

One reason that Mr. Gore did not in the end do better among white voters, according to Mr. Edsall, is that Mr. Gore's support for gun control weakened his appeal to blue-collar white male voters and that intensive anti-Gore efforts by the National Rifle Association prevented him from winning more of their support. "The problem for Democrats," Mr. Edsall reported in October, "is that gun control is unpopular among many of the swing voters both campaigns are targeting in the final weeks of the campaign, particularly in battleground states—such as Michigan, Missouri, Ohio, and Pennsylvania—with a sizable bloc of hunters and other gun enthusiasts." As a result, Mr. Gore began to moderate his anti-gun rhetoric and back away from his support for gun control. Pollster Andrew Kohut, director of the Pew Research Center, noted that "Gore's decision to de-emphasize gun control may be based on poll trends that show a reduction in the overall support for gun control, especially among men."

Nevertheless, Mr. Gore's populist strategy did seek to appeal to white working class voters and thereby cut into the political base of his opponent. Coupled with his success in winning non-white voting blocs through appeals to racial fears and animosity, his strategy did win the popular vote for president and lost the electoral vote only because of the Nader challenge and after a series of agonizing recounts and court battles in Florida.

The conclusion is inescapable: George W. Bush won the election not because his "compassionate conservatism," "Big Tent," or "Rainbow

Republicanism" mobilized a majority of voters or attracted non-whites but because the political left was split between the Democrats and the Naderites. The Democrats won the popular vote and, despite the Naderite rebellion, nearly won the election because they explicitly appealed to and made use of the racial solidarity and racial consciousness that drives the majority of non-white voters, while at the same time using white working-class economic anxieties to attract white voters and cut into their opponents' neglected political/demographic base.

For all the rhetoric of the "new Republicans" about winning non-whites, the lesson of the 2000 election for the GOP ought to be clear as well: Trying to win non-whites, especially by abandoning issues important to white voters, while neglecting, abandoning, or alienating whites, is the road to political suicide. The natural and logical strategy of the Republican Party in the future is to seek to maximize its white vote as much as possible.

The ethnic and racial analysis of the 2000 presidential election carries special implications for advocates of immigration reform and control. Either the Republicans or any other party able and willing to do so could attract the white votes that are the backbone of the GOP by embracing issues such as immigration control and supporting a long-term moratorium on legal immigration, terminating welfare and other public benefits for immigrants, seeking the abolition of affirmative action, and working for the repeal of "hate crime" laws, the end of multi-culturalism, and similar policies. Not only would such issues mobilize white voters legitimately concerned about the impact of mass immigration on themselves and their communities and nation, but terminating mass immigration would also slow down or halt the formation of new ethnically and racially driven bloc constituencies that immigration imports into American politics. The Republicans or any other party making use of this strategy could thus become and remain a majority party by appealing to and seeking to raise white racial consciousness; they do not have to do so and should not do so by appealing to irrational racial fears and animosities. Rather, they can and legitimately should encourage white voters to (1) perceive that they as a group are under threat from the racial and demographic trends in this country and the racial politics those trends indicate and (2) believe that the Republican Party (or an alternative political vehicle) will consistently support them and their interests against this threat.

Advocates of Rainbow Republicanism will argue that this strategy is not possible or desirable, that it will only promote racial divisions, and that attracting more white voters than the Republicans now are able to win is not a practical goal. This line of argument is invalid. Racial animosity is already being inflamed—by the Democrats' willingness to exploit anti-white sentiments and by racial demagogues such as Jesse Jackson, Al Sharpton, the NAACP, and analogous Hispanic racial extremists. The only force that can quell or check this kind of anti-white racism is the solidarity of whites against it and against those who try to use it for political gain.

As for the possibility of winning more white votes, it is entirely feasible, as the 67 percent and 64 percent white majorities won by Richard Nixon and Ronald Reagan in 1972 and 1984 show. It is quite true that neither Nixon nor Reagan ever did much to address white concerns once they had won their votes, but a political leader who actually did seek to address such concerns could surely win that level of white support again. Some 82 percent of the 102 million Americans who voted in the election of 2000 were white; George W. Bush won 54 percent of them, or about 45 million. Had he won 65 percent of white voters, he would have won more than 54 million white votes, or 9 million more votes than he did win. There is no reason why that or even higher levels of white support are not possible.

Indeed, even that level of white support is not essential for decisive Republican political victory. As Steve Sailer showed in an analysis for Peter Brimelow's website last fall, if Mr. Bush had cultivated his natural base and increased his share of the white vote by only a few percentage points, he would have won the election overwhelmingly. If, instead of 54 percent, he had won 57 percent (his father won 59 percent in 1988), he would have won an Electoral College landslide of 367 to 171. What if winning another three percent of the white vote had required appeals that scared away so many non-whites that their support dropped by more than a third, from 21 percent to 13 percent? Mr. Bush still would have won comfortably, with 310 electoral votes to 228. Even if by increasing his percentage of the white vote by three percentage points Mr. Bush had reduced the number of his non-white supporters to zero, he still would have wound up with a tie in the Electoral College. Mr. Sailer points out that 92 percent of Mr. Bush's votes came from whites; it is suicidal folly for the Republicans to abandon the

issues and strategies that attract these voters in pursuit of non-white Republicans who never materialize.

Mr. Brimelow himself has noted that, for all the Republican foreboding about the growing Hispanic and non-white presence in the electorates of California and other states, Southern whites now and historically have had to confront even larger racial disparities in the electorates of their own states. Blacks in the South constitute about 35 percent to 40 percent of the electorate of that region and, there as elsewhere, vote as a highly unified bloc. Nevertheless, the largely white Republican Party in the South routinely manages to win majorities in these states for both presidential and many congressional and gubernatorial candidates. It is able to do so because white Southerners—far more than whites elsewhere—vote as a bloc. In the election last year, exit polls showed that whites in the South voted for Mr. Bush by 66 percent; in the three other regions (East, West, and Midwest), white voters supported Mr. Bush by an average of only 49 percent. Obviously, white racial consciousness remains highest in the South, though the election of 2000 shows that there is, among a small majority of whites and especially white men, at least a kind of racial subconscious in much of the rest of the country as well. Only if whites of both sexes and in all parts of the nation bring that subconscious to the surface and make it a real force in national politics by translating it into political action at the polls can they expect to resist the ethnopolitics that threatens them and their future. If they do not and if the Republican Party proves itself incapable of leading them in doing so, then the Brimelow-Rubenstein thesis that uncontrolled immigration coupled with emerging non-white racial solidarity in voting behavior means the end of the GOP as a major national party will have been proved true.

*This article originally appeared in the spring 2001 issue of the* Social Contract. *It is reprinted by permission of the* Social Contract, *445 E. Mitchell Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.*

* * *

* * *

# The Christian Question

James C. Russell, *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity: A Sociohistorical Approach to Religious Transformation*; Oxford University Press, 1994, 258 pp., $19.95.

*At the time he died in 2005, Francis had active editorial roles with several publications, including* Chronicles, *the* Citizen's Informer, Middle American News *and the* Occidental Quarterly. *The quarterly was founded with his help and he served as its associate and book editor. The following review, which he wrote for the inaugural issue of fall 2001, was not of a recently published book but of an underappreciated classic by Francis's friend and colleague Jim Russell. It is yet another demonstration of the great breadth of perspective Francis brought to bear on questions of race and civilization.*

*As the first sentence shows, it is also an example of how difficult it is to remove all repetition from a collection of essays that were originally published separately and at many years remove from each other. I have very lightly edited a few of these selections to avoid duplication, but in this case that was not possible.*

*

"Christian theology is the grandmother of Bolshevism," Oswald Spengler wrote many years ago. What he meant was that Christianity's endorsement of such ideas as universalism, egalitarianism, peace, world brotherhood, and universal altruism helped establish and legitimize the ethics and politics invoked by socialists and communists. Socialists and communists don't always agree, however, which is why another German scholar, Karl Marx, pronounced that religion is in fact a conservatizing force, the opiate of the masses, the drug that prevents the workers of the world from rebelling against their class enemies.

Both of these Teutonic heavyweights might have profited from reading James C. Russell's *The Germanization of Early Medieval Christianity*, since

it speaks, at least indirectly, to the tension between their different views of Christianity, differences that continue to be reflected in political and ideological disputes on the European and American right today. The main question in the controversy is this: Is Christianity a force that supports or opposes the efforts of the right to defend the European-American way of life? Christians on the right argue that their religious commitments are central to Western civilization, while pagans and secularists on the right (especially in Europe) argue, with Spengler, that Christianity undermines the West by pushing a universalism that rejects race, class, family, and even nation.

Mr. Russell, who holds a doctorate in historical theology from Fordham University and teaches at Saint Peter's College, does not quite answer the question, but his immensely learned and closely reasoned book does suggest an answer. His thesis is that early Christianity flourished in the decadent, deracinated, and alienated world of late antiquity precisely because it was able to appeal to various oppressed or dissatisfied sectors of the population—slaves, urbanized proletarians, women, intellectuals, frustrated aristocrats, and the odd idealist repelled by the pathological materialism, brutality, and banality of the age.

But when Christian missionaries tried to appeal to the Germanic invaders by invoking the universalism, pacifism, and egalitarianism that had attracted the alienated inhabitants of the empire, they failed. That was because the Germans practiced a folk religion that reflected ethnic homogeneity, social hierarchy, military glory and heroism, and "standards of ethical conduct … derived from a sociobiological drive for group survival through ingroup altruism." Germanic religion and society were "world-accepting," while Hellenic Christianity was "world-rejecting," reflecting the influence of Oriental religions and ethics. By "Germans," it should be noted, Mr. Russell does not mean modern residents of Germany but rather "the Gothic, Frankish, Saxon, Burgundian, Alamannic, Suevic, and Vandal peoples, but also … the Viking peoples of Scandinavia and the Anglo-Saxon peoples of Britain." With the exception of the Celts and the Slavs, "Germans" thus means almost the same thing as "European" itself.

Given the contradictions between the Christian ethics and world-view and those of the Indo-European culture of the Germanic peoples, the only tactic Christians could use was one of appearing to adopt Germanic values and claiming that Christian values were really compatible with them. The

bulk of Mr. Russell's scholarship shows how this process of accommodation took place in the course of about four centuries. The saints and Christ Himself were depicted as Germanic warrior heroes; both festivals and locations sacred in ancient Germanic cults were quietly taken over by the Christians as their own; and words and concepts with religious meanings and connotations were subtly redefined in terms of the new religion. Yet the final result was not that the Germans were converted to the Christianity they had originally encountered, but rather that that form of Christianity was "Germanized," coming to adopt many of the same Indo-European folk values that the old pagan religion had celebrated.

Mr. Russell thus suggests, as noted above, a resolution of the debate over Christian universalism. The early Christianity that the Germans encountered contained a good many universalist tendencies, adapted and reinforced by the disintegrating social fabric and deracinated peoples of the late empire. But thanks to Germanization, those elements were soon suppressed or muted and what we know as the historical Christianity of the medieval era offered a religion, ethic, and world-view that supported what we today know as "conservative values"—social hierarchy, loyalty to tribe and place (blood and soil), world-acceptance rather than world-rejection, and an ethic that values heroism and military sacrifice. In being "Germanized," Christianity was essentially reinvented as the dynamic faith that animated European civilization for a thousand years and more.

Mr. Russell's answer to the question about Christianity is that Christianity is both the grandmother of Bolshevism (in its early universalist, non-Western form) and a pillar of social stabilization and order (through the values and world-view imported into it through contact with the ancient barbarians). Throughout most of its history, the latter has prevailed, but today, as Mr. Russell argues in the last pages of his work, the enemies of the European (Germanic) heritage—what he calls "the Euro-Christian religiocultural fusion"—have begun to triumph within Christian ranks. "Opposition to this fusion, especially as it might interfere with notions of universalism and ecumenism, was expressed in several of the documents of the Second Vatican Council," and he sees the same kind of opposition to the early medieval Germanic influence in the various reform movements in church history, including the Protestant Reformation, which always demand a return to the "primitive church"—i.e., pre-Germanic Christianity. It is precisely this rejection of the European heritage that may have driven many

Christians of European background out of Christianity altogether and into alternative forms of paganism that positively affirm their racial and cultural roots.

Whatever primitive Christianity or true Christianity or historical Christianity may or may not have believed and taught, what is indisputably happening today is the deliberate extirpation from Christianity of the European heritage by its enemies within the churches. The institutional Christianity that flourishes today is no longer the same religion as that practiced by Charlemagne and his successors, and it can no longer support the civilization they formed. Indeed, organized Christianity today is the enemy of the West and the race that created it.

Mr. Russell has produced a deeply learned book that assimilates history and theology, sociology and comparative religion, and even sociobiology and genetics within its pages. Moreover, it is an important book that addresses a highly controversial and philosophically and culturally significant issue that few others will address at all.

*This article originally appeared in the fall 2001 issue (vol. I, no. 1) of the* Occidental Quarterly. *It is reprinted with permission by the* Occidental Quarterly, *P.O. Box 695, Mount Airy, Maryland 21771.*

* * *

* * *

# The Return of the Repressed

## Introduction to *Race and the American Prospect*

*At the time of his death, Francis was in the final stages of editing a major collection of essays called* Race and the American Prospect. *He had great hopes for what he thought would be a collection so powerful and convincing that it would open a major breach in the wall against the discussion of the legitimate interests of whites. The book was published in 2006 by the Occidental Press (www.toqonline.com).*

*The introduction to the book reflects Francis's most mature and detailed description of the crisis whites face as a race, and the forms that the consciousness necessary for the resolution of that crisis must take.*

*

In the Victorian era, the Great Taboo was sex. Today, whatever the label we attach to our own age, the Great Taboo is race. The Victorians virtually denied that sex existed. Today, race is confidently asserted to be "merely a social construct," a product of the imagination—and of none too healthy imaginations at that—rather than a reality of nature. The Victorians severely punished people who talked about sex, made jokes about sex, or wrote too openly and frankly about sex. Today, journalists, disc jockeys, leading sports figures, public officials, distinguished academics, and major political leaders who violate the racial taboos of our age are fired from their newspapers, networks, or radio stations; forced to resign their positions; condemned by their own colleagues; and subjected to "investigations" of their "backgrounds" and their "links" to other individuals and groups that have also violated the race taboo. We have not, at least in this country so far, reached the point where violating the race taboo brings criminal prosecution and imprisonment, as in both Europe and Canada it may well do, but there are several cases of supposed "white supremacists" being arrested or harassed by law enforcement agencies largely because of their

alleged beliefs about race, and the constant agitation for ever more stringent measures against "hate crimes" and "hate speech" seems to point toward the eventual official entrenchment of the race taboo in formal law. Meanwhile, if the government is still restricted in the action it can take to stifle and suppress "racism," the "anti-racist" political left seems to enjoy virtual carte blanche to denounce, vilify, spy on, demonstrate against, intimidate, and even occasionally beat up individuals and organizations that have transgressed the racial Victorianism of our age.

If the analogy between the Victorian taboo on sex and the contemporary taboo on race is valid, then the essays in this book are logically the analogue of pornography, or what conventional Victorians regarded as pornography. Every one of these essays deals with race in a way that the dominant culture of the present day rejects, forbids, and indeed punishes by one means or another. Every one of them deals with aspects of race—its reality as a part of the biological and psychological nature of man and its importance as a social and historical force—that contemporary culture is at best reluctant to discuss at all and absolutely refuses to acknowledge as true. At the same time, in contradiction to the stereotype promoted by "anti-racist" forces, not one of these essays or their authors expresses here or anywhere else any desire to harm, exploit, dominate, or deny the legitimate rights of other races. This book is not a tract promoting "white supremacy" or the restoration of forced segregation.

All the contributors to this volume are white, well-educated, and articulate; several are or have been academics or professional journalists and authors, and what unites and drives them as a group is a common concern that their race today faces a crisis that within the coming century could easily lead to either its physical extinction, its subordination to and persecution by other races, or the destruction of its civilization.

Most readers who continue to believe what the dominant culture tells them about the meaning and significance of race will find this concern bizarre. They will at once respond that in the first place, as noted, race does not really exist or, if it does, that it consists of nothing more than superficial and socially irrelevant features of gross physical morphology—skin color, hair texture, height, perhaps skull shape, et cetera. Even if race does exist as a biological reality, it certainly has no meaning for behavior, culture, intelligence, or other traits that influence and shape social institutions. Moreover, any effort to take race more seriously is either a deliberate and

covert attempt to justify racial hatred or injustice, or is at best a misguided enterprise that is all too likely to lead to hatred, injustice, and even genocide, as it has in the past. This is the conventional attitude toward race that the dominant culture in the West today promotes and enforces, and it is precisely from that attitude and its unspoken premises that the authors of these essays dissent.

The commonly held beliefs about race mentioned above—that it does not exist or is not important and that serious concern about race and racial identity leads to negative and undesirable consequences—are wrong, as these essays demonstrate, and yet it is precisely those beliefs that make it impossible for whites who accept them to preserve themselves as a race—as what scientist J. Philippe Rushton defines as "a group related by common descent, blood, or heredity"[1]—and the civilization and political institutions their race has created. White racial consciousness, the shared awareness of whites that their racial identity and heritage are real and important and worth preserving, is by far the most taboo of all beliefs about race, a taboo that is not enforced consistently or at all against the consciousness of other races. As black historian Shelby Steele acknowledged in the *Wall Street Journal* (November 13, 2003), "Racial identity is simply forbidden to whites in America and across the entire Western world. Black children today are hammered with the idea of racial identity and pride, yet racial pride in whites constitutes a grave evil. Say 'I'm white and I'm proud' and you are a Nazi." Mr. Steele, however, was certainly not pointing to the double standard in order to promote or legitimize white consciousness. Indeed, he made use of the widely shared (by non-whites as well as whites) demonic view of whites to reject and deny any white claim to their own racial identity:

> No group in recent history has more aggressively seized power in the name of its racial superiority than Western whites. This race illustrated for all time—through colonialism, slavery, white racism, Nazism—the extraordinary human evil that follows when great power is joined to an atavistic sense of superiority and destiny. This is why today's whites, the world over, cannot openly have a racial identity.

Louis Farrakhan, Al Sharpton, and Jesse Jackson, as well as Hispanic leaders such as Cruz Bustamante and Mario Obledo, have no problem

exulting in their own racial identity and exhorting their people in support of racial solidarity and the political power they expect such solidarity to yield, exultations and exhortations that are often expressed in language that is explicitly anti-white, in the most primitive and threatening terms. Yet they are seldom called to account for it and are often rewarded, if not because of it, at least in spite of it. When Mr. Obledo, for example, proclaimed a few years ago, "California is going to be a Mexican state, we are going to control all the institutions. If people don't like it they should leave—go back to Europe," he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President Clinton soon afterward. It is not very likely that a prominent white leader today who said, as Sen. Stephen Douglas in a debate with Abraham Lincoln in 1858 did say, "I believe this government was made on the white basis. I believe it was made by white men for the benefit of white men and their posterity forever" would be awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom. Douglas's comment (and many similar ones) expressed a sentiment more or less parallel to Mr. Obledo's, though Douglas did not go so far as to invite non-whites to leave the country (it was Lincoln himself who did that in his proposal for the expatriation of blacks a few years later; in any case the state of Illinois had already outlawed free black residency in its constitution, so it was not an issue in the election). Douglas in fact won the election and was the Democratic Party's national candidate for president two years later.

Indeed, in contrast to the rewards heaped on Mr. Obledo, when Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott in December 2002 made his casual remark that the country would have been better off had Strom Thurmond won the 1948 presidential election, he was denounced with more than a solid week of public obloquy from both the political right and left and hounded into resigning his leadership position in the U.S. Senate. Mr. Lott had said nothing about race or Mr. Thurmond's segregationist platform in that election, nor did he utter any racial epithets or insults, and there was no evidence he was even thinking about that aspect of the campaign; but he was obliged to engage in protracted and repeated retractions, explanations, and apologies anyway—all to no avail. The same is true of baseball player John Rocker, whose acerbic remarks in a 1999 interview in *Sports Illustrated* about riding the subway in New York City contained no racial allusions whatever but were widely interpreted as referring to race. Mr.

Rocker was obliged to undergo psychiatric counseling because of his remarks and was fortunate in not being professionally ruined.

One main reason for the obvious double standard on the racial consciousness that is permitted for and even demanded of non-white racial groups but forbidden to whites is that non-whites are easily inflamed and mobilized by the slightest or merely apparent suggestions of white identity, consciousness, solidarity, or pride by eminent public figures such as Senator Lott or Mr. Rocker, and their mobilization can have disastrous consequences for institutions—the Republican Party, the Atlanta Braves—that seek or depend on non-white votes or market patronage. Non-white racial consciousness facilitates both mass political and economic mobilization against the white enemy and is almost unfailingly successful in intimidating such institutions into firing, demoting, or penalizing the white transgressors, and often in paying immense sums to compensate for any racial wrongs, real or imagined, inflicted (as did the restaurant chain Denny's because of class action lawsuits brought by black patrons who alleged racial discrimination in service). Yet non-white racial solidarity and antagonism are by no means the only reasons why whites "cannot openly have a racial identity."

The truth is that whites deny themselves a racial identity, and one major reason they do so is that many of them, especially white elites, buy into or accept, consciously or unconsciously, premises that deny the reality and significance of race, as well as unquestioned beliefs about the evilness and worthlessness of whites themselves. Mr. Steele can utter sweeping generalizations about "the extraordinary human evil" that whites have exhibited throughout their history (entirely ignoring the long and brutal history of slavery, conquest, genocide, and repression by non-whites in Africa and Asia that persists to this day) in a major newspaper owned and managed by whites simply because it does not occur to most members of the white elite to question the expression of this kind of anti-white opinion. To some extent white tolerance of such anti-white sentiments is due to the racial guilt that has been injected into white minds, but to a larger degree it is due simply to ignorance, indifference, and an intellectually lazy refusal to question the denial of race and the demonization of whites that have come to prevail in the Western world and to the conviction, promulgated by ideologically driven academics, the media, and almost all public figures, that race does not exist or is not important, at least for whites.

The consequences of this denial and demonization for whites and the civilization they have created and ruled for the last several centuries are what concerns the contributors to this collection of essays. The processes by which those consequences may come about are already apparent. For more than a decade it has been acknowledged (by the U.S. Census Bureau and leading demographers) that because of mass non-white immigration and the differential fertility rates between whites and non-whites, by approximately the year 2050 the United States will cease to be a majority white country for the first time in its history. As with other aspects of racial reality, most whites seem to be either ignorant of that projection or indifferent to it, but some—such as former President Bill Clinton—actually welcome it. In an interview with black journalists in the White House on June 11, 1997, *Boston Globe* columnist Derrick Jackson reported, President Clinton remarked that the coming racial transformation of the country "will arguably be the third great revolution in America," proving that we can live "without in effect having a dominant European culture. We want to become a multi-racial, multi-ethnic society. We're not going to disintegrate in the face of it" (*Boston Globe*, June 13, 1997). Mr. Clinton's opinion is by no means confined to those of his liberal convictions. In 1996, in the course of the debate over immigration in California, U.S. Rep. Robert Dornan, one of the most conservative members of the Congress, boasted of his indifference to race and skin color in a campaign speech. "I want to see America stay a nation of immigrants," he intoned not long before election day, "and if we lose our Northern European stock—your coloring and mine, blue eyes and fair hair—tough!" Moreover, George W. Bush himself, campaigning in August 2000, proclaimed to a Hispanic audience in Miami his own vision of the coming multi-racial, multi-cultural America:

> America has one national creed, but many accents. We are now one of the largest Spanish-speaking nations in the world. We're a major source of Latin music, journalism, and culture.
>
> Just go to Miami, or San Antonio, Los Angeles, Chicago, or West New York, New Jersey … and close your eyes and listen. You could just as easily be in Santo Domingo or Santiago, or San Miguel de Allende.
>
> For years our nation has debated this change—some have praised it and others have resented it. By nominating me, my party has made a choice to welcome the new America.

All these white leaders and many others like them no doubt assume that the multi-racial future of the country will not threaten whites or the country because all races accept or are coming to accept the rejections of race that are now prevalent in their own minds and in the culture and public policies they reflect and promote. But this assumption is demonstrably wrong. The evidence is that while whites are either publicly oblivious to their own racial identity and interests or are actually anti-white, non-whites, as Mr. Steele noted, are insistent on the importance of racial identity and consciousness and concerted public action based on racial identity. The policy of racial "color blindness" on which the "civil rights revolution" was supposedly founded has turned out to be a fraud and a failure. Like most revolutions, the one led by non-whites such as Martin Luther King, Jr. moved from a moderate phase demanding merely equal treatment and the end of legal racial discrimination to a far more radical stage demanding outright racial privileges for non-whites (through "affirmative action") and a myriad of special exemptions and policies designed to benefit and empower non-whites (e.g., allowing or encouraging exclusively black, Hispanic, or Indian clubs, associations, and political groups and not infrequently forcing whites to subsidize them, but rigorously forbidding and denouncing such racially distinctive groups for whites) and at the same time attacking and demonizing white institutions, icons, symbols, and heroes, and eventually whites themselves as a group. It is the radical phase of the revolution that has now become established and threatens to become even more radical as non-white numbers and power increase, as non-white racial consciousness evolves to higher and more aggressive levels of expression, and as a prohibited white racial consciousness continues to dwindle and the white capacity to mobilize resistance to racial aggression vanishes with it.

"Color blindness," in other words, has failed, if it was ever seriously intended in the first place, and the main reason it failed is that it denied a biological reality. Today, after decades of such denial, race has been rediscovered. It has been rediscovered in two ways. First, race has been rediscovered scientifically as a factual reality of nature. The work of scientists such as Arthur Jensen, William Shockley, J. Philippe Rushton, H.J. Eysenck, Richard Lynn, Richard Herrnstein, and a number of others has established, contrary to the claims of the Franz Boas "environmentalist" or "social determinist" school of the social sciences, that race exists and is a significant factor in such human mental traits as intelligence. There is really

little doubt about this today, and fewer and fewer scientists dispute it, though few also are willing to risk their careers by talking or writing about it in violation of the race taboo. Indeed, the reality of biologically based differences between the races has been known for decades, if not longer, and as long ago as 1981 Arthur Jensen could itemize a host of such differences:

> Different races have evolved in somewhat different ways, making for many differences among them. A few of the many physical characteristics found to display genetic variation between different races are body size and proportions, hair form and distribution, head shape and facial features, cranial capacity and brain formation, blood types, number of vertebrae, size of genitalia, bone density, fingerprints, basic metabolic rate, body temperature, blood pressure, heat and cold tolerance, number and distribution of sweat glands, odor, consistency of ear wax, number of teeth, age at eruption of permanent teeth, fissural patterns on the surfaces of the teeth, length of gestation period, frequency of twin births, male-female birth ratio, physical maturity at birth, rate of infant development of alpha brain waves, colorblindness, visual and auditory acuity, intolerance of milk, galvanic skin resistance, chronic diseases, susceptibility to infectious diseases, genetic diseases (e.g., Tay-Sachs, sickle cell anemia), and pigmentation of the skin, hair, and eyes.[2]

The scientific evidence for the natural reality and social significance of race is now overwhelming, despite the persistence and prevalence of race denial in public forums. Racial differences in intelligence and behavior patterns significantly affect such societal differences as levels of technological achievement, political stability and freedom, criminal violence, and standards of living. What kind of society and how much civilization a people creates is now clearly known to be related to what kind of race they are. Race—a concept that includes far more than skin color and encompasses the collective and distinctive genetic endowments of a people—by itself is certainly not sufficient to create civilization, but it is necessary to creating it. Take away the white race that created the civilization that has continued from ancient Egypt to today, and the civilization will wither. Non-whites may indeed create a different civilization of their own, but it

will not be the same as the one we as whites created and live in, and most of us (or even most non-whites today) would not want to live in it.

The recognition of the reality and significance of race does not imply or lead to "hate" or domination of one race by another, but racial differentiation does imply social differentiation—that is, the existence of significant biological differences between groups of human beings means there will probably be social differences between them: differences in educational and economic achievement, personal and political behavior, and social and cultural institutions. And if there is social differentiation between races, then competition and conflict between them is also likely, especially if they occupy the same territory. "Hatred," domination, and racial antagonism may therefore result, not as relationships to be desired or advocated, but as the consequence of the natural reality of racial differences and the effort to ignore or deny such differences by the delusions of "multi-racialism," "multi-culturalism," "universalism," and "egalitarianism."

The second way in which race has been rediscovered is as a social and political force, which has taken the form of the racial consciousness and solidarity that in the last century has swept through the non-white populations of the United States and the world. This rediscovery constitutes what Lothrop Stoddard in the frank language of the 1920s called "The Rising Tide of Color against White World Supremacy" and is identical to what the late Robert Nisbet termed the "racial revolution." While Marxism, Nisbet wrote, "has, on the whole, endeavored to persuade blacks and other races historically under white domination that they fall into the more general category of the proletariat," the "single fact … that stands out" is "that racial revolution as an aspiration is becoming increasingly separate from other philosophies or strategies of revolution."

> The distinguishing feature of 20th-century revolutionary behavior and thought has proved to be … precisely its racial character. The signal revolts of the past half-century, the major insurrections and mass liberations, have been precisely those buoyed up by appeal to race and color. The greatest single 20th-century revolutionary movement has been that of the blacks, revolting against not capitalists primarily, but *whites*—in Africa and, to a modified degree, in the United States and other Western countries.

> And ethnic revolt—whether black, Oriental, Chicano, or whatever—has commonly carried with it hostility to all manifestations of Western-white culture, not merely those identifiable as capitalist.[3]

What has occurred in the last century, then, consists of two processes—first, the evisceration of white racial consciousness and identity (through the pseudoscientific denial of race, the political and cultural demonization of whites, and the political and legal destruction of white political and cultural power) and second, the development, around the same time, of the non-white and increasingly anti-white racial consciousness that animates the emerging national non-white majority and similar emerging majorities in other white countries. The scientific rediscovery of race as a socially and historically significant reality of nature is part of a reaction against the "racial revolution" and can be expected to assist in the revival and relegitimization of white racial identity, but by itself it remains largely an academic abstraction understood by only a handful of scientists and scholars. It is no doubt necessary to instigate a revived white racial consciousness but that alone is not sufficient to ensure the survival of whites as a race or of their civilization.

What is necessary is an explicit revival of white racial consciousness, in opposition to the anti-white racial consciousness now engulfing whites and their societies and to the denial of race that is commonplace in white public rhetoric and the dominant public ideology. There are three general reasons why a revival of white racial consciousness and identity is needed.

In the first place, we now know enough about the biologically grounded cognitive and behavioral differences between the races to be able to say with confidence that race deeply affects and shapes cultural life. Certainly neither the modern West, with its scientific and technological achievements, nor the ancient West, with its vast political organization and sophisticated artistic, literary, and philosophical legacies, could have been produced by races with a lower level of cognitive capacity, nor is the dynamism characteristic of white Westerners—their inclinations to innovation, exploration, expansion, and conquest—apparent among most non-white races, even if their cognitive capacities are greater than those of whites. As noted above, what kind of society and how much civilization a people creates is now clearly known to be related to what kind of race they are, and the decline or disappearance of the white race can be anticipated to

impoverish what remains of Western civilization, however much "evil" black apologists such as Shelby Steele may attribute to it.

Second, regardless of the role of biologically based racial differences in accounting for behavioral and cultural differences, whites, like any race, should wish to survive and flourish simply for their own sake, just as we would wish our family, our community, our country, our civilization to survive and flourish, whatever their merits or flaws. Even this minimal rationale for racial survival is denied to whites today because of the constant demonization of whites that non-whites and whites themselves heap on them and because of the blindness of whites—like that of Congressman Dornan, quoted above—to their own racial identity.

And third, white racial consciousness is necessary simply as a means of self-protection. White racial identity is an integral component of the historic identity of America as a culture and a nation. The emergence of an explicit racial consciousness among non-whites in a country that remains (so far) majority white and in which whites have constituted the culturally defining and dominant race creates tensions that are already obvious and threaten to become far more dangerous and destabilizing in the future. Explicit white racial consciousness has been a commonplace and important feature of American history, a belief that has shaped the events, leaders, institutions, and norms that have defined us as a people and a nation throughout our past and in all regions. For white Americans today to abandon the concept of race and adopt "racial universalism" would mean not simply an adjustment or a "reform," let alone a continuation of the proper direction of American history, but a revolutionary reconstruction of the American identity.

Even more dangerously, the absence of racial consciousness among whites disarms them as a group in confrontation with races that possess such a consciousness. Blacks, Hispanics, Asians, and other non-white racial and ethnic groups are able to act and react in highly unified patterns, political and cultural, to protect or advance what their leaders perceive as their racial interests and, in particular, to resist, denounce, and attack any manifestation of white racial solidarity.

Whites are unable to so act and react because they do not exist as a self-conscious racial group. Whites may be more or less unified with respect to objective material characteristics—income, educational achievement, patterns of residence, voting behavior, et cetera—but they are not unified and indeed barely even exist with respect to subjective racial consciousness

and identity, and are therefore at a disadvantage in meeting competitive challenges from groups that are unified by explicit racial consciousness and identity. Divided by various class, regional, political, ideological, religious, and other differences, whites will face a dangerous and uncertain future in a society dominated by racially unified non-whites. At a time when anti-white racial and ethnic groups define themselves in explicitly racial terms, only our own unity and identity as a race will be able to meet their challenge. If and when that challenge should triumph and those enemies come to kill us as the Tutsis were slaughtered in Rwanda or as Robert Mugabe has threatened to do to whites in Zimbabwe, they will do so not because we are "Westerners" or "Americans" or "Christians" or "conservatives" or "liberals," but because we are white.

What political forms a new white racial consciousness might or should take is not yet clear, but at least it must be sufficiently strong and widespread to be able to resist and balance the anti-white tide that threatens whites. Given the intensity of non-white racial consciousness, the emergence of a counterbalancing white consciousness may well lead to violent conflict between the races. There is in fact an immense level of violent conflict against whites going on right now through interracial crime and terrorism, conflict that is abetted by judicial constraints imposed on law enforcement; by gun control measures that disarm law-abiding whites against armed non-white criminals; by mass immigration, legal and illegal; and by the deliberate refusal of ruling white elites to enforce their own laws and protect their own people and communities. Violent and authoritarian resolutions of the racial conflict of our age are certainly not desirable and are not advocated by anyone contributing to this collection, but violence and repression are sufficiently common in human history that they cannot be excluded as eventual consequences, despite our preferences.

Although, as historian William McNeill has pointed out, racial supremacy or what he calls "ethnic hierarchy" has been the norm in multi-racial societies throughout history,[4] the restoration of white racial supremacy in the United States today is not desirable or probably even possible. In multi-racial societies in which significant cognitive differences between the races exist, the level of civilization that can be sustained tends to be limited. A race that dominates another needs to establish what is essentially an authoritarian system of political and social control that inhibits the dominant race almost as much as it restrains the subject race. It

is hardly an accident that so many multi-racial empires in human history have been authoritarian regimes in which the dominant race monopolizes power. A ruling race also needs to maintain constant vigilance and live in perpetual trepidation of racial revolt, violence, crime, and political destabilization, to guard against subversion of the racial order by its own disaffected members, and to worry about and prevent its own demographic displacement by the subject race through differential fertility rates and interracial breeding. Moreover, the racial supremacy of whites over other ethnic and racial groups rarely endures for long. Throughout their racial history from the prehistoric Indo-European invasions of Western Asia and India to the 19th century, whites have almost always conquered and dominated the peoples with whom they came in prolonged contact, at least until they themselves were displaced or absorbed by the very populations they conquered. What we are seeing today in countries such as Zimbabwe and South Africa as well as more protractedly in Europe, Australia, and the United States and Canada—the revolt of once-subordinate non-whites against the once-dominant white race—is in essence merely a repetition on a grand scale of what seems to have happened to the Indo-European aristocracies of non-Indo-European peoples in antiquity, the ruling class of the Roman Empire, and the Frankish Crusaders who conquered the Near East in the 11th and 12th centuries.

Whites who today continue to harbor romantic images of the lost paradise of white supremacy should reflect that the civilization whites actually created usually originated in what were the largely racially homogeneous populations of Europe, not in those where racial oligarchies prevailed (and eventually failed to prevail). White supremacy was able to exist at all only because whites possessed a powerful racial consciousness, and non-whites did not. Today, that situation is reversed—with ominous implications for the dwindling white population.

Probably the most desirable and mutually satisfactory (if not the most likely) resolution of the escalating racial conflict would be the voluntary separation of races into distinct nations. There are obvious problems with such a division of the national territory—who would get which part, what would happen to those of one race who refused to leave the areas assigned to another race, who would be counted as part of a race and why, how would the separation be authorized, how would each section be governed, et cetera. Moreover, most white Americans would recoil from endorsing an

actual territorial division of the nation for whatever reason. Racial separatism, far more than "white supremacy," is today favored by most whites advocating white racial consciousness, but there appears to be little prospect of the larger white population embracing it in the near future. Nor is "racial federalism," under which local communities or even whole states determine their own racial arrangements, laws, and policies, likely. The insistence by nationally dominant elites that race and immigration policies that are effectively anti-white be determined entirely by the centralized state under their own control means that localism and federalism are no more probable in race relations than in most other areas of American public life.

Nevertheless, if whites cannot expect a total, permanent, and mutually satisfactory resolution of the racial conflict through separation or federalism, they can at least work to achieve results that would protect or guarantee their own survival and that of their civilization. The political, legal, and cultural agenda on which whites should insist includes a permanent moratorium on all legal immigration into the United States, the expulsion of illegal aliens, the rigorous enforcement of laws against illegal immigration, and the removal of incentives to further illegal immigration (e.g., availability of welfare, education, and affirmative action for illegal aliens and of automatic birthright citizenship for their children); the end of all "affirmative action" programs and policies and of all "civil rights" laws that discriminate against whites and circumscribe their constitutional rights of association; the repeal of all "hate crime" laws and "Politically Correct" policies and regulations that penalize the peaceful expression of white racial consciousness and identity; and the abolition of all multi-culturalist curricula, "sensitivity training," and similar experiments in brainwashing in schools, universities, businesses, and government. At the same time whites must seek to rebuild their own institutions—schools, businesses, churches, media, et cetera—in which their own heritage and identity as whites can be preserved, honored, and transmitted to their descendants, and they must encourage measures that will help raise their own birth rates to at least replacement levels. Even these policies, however, would pit racially conscious whites against the dominant elites that continue to demand white racial dispossession and their non-white allies. Moreover, none of these measures will be adopted unless and until white racial consciousness is far more developed than it is today. Neither conventional conservative nor

liberal ideologues show any serious interest in these particular measures or the racial identity they reflect, nor does either of the major political parties.

Whatever the precise political form that a resurrected white racial consciousness might take, the future of whites without such a binding and animating identity looks bleak. Already whites are finding themselves denied admission to major universities and access to important upward career paths because of "affirmative action," a euphemism that masks the explicitly anti-white impact of such policies. The most obvious symbols and icons of the racially incorrect white past—those of the American South—have been demonized and largely removed from public display, often with the cooperation or even at the instigation of white leaders themselves. But the attack on white culture is by no means confined to the Confederate flag and Southern symbols. Presidents such as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, Andrew Jackson, and even such liberal icons as Abraham Lincoln and Woodrow Wilson have all come under non-white attack for their racial beliefs and practices, as have the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. Holidays such as Christmas, Thanksgiving, and Columbus Day are also denounced as commemorations of white repression, exploitation, and genocide of Indians and other non-whites, while Martin Luther King Day imports into our official national hagiography not only a non-white figure but King's entire ideology and agenda of white guilt and racial revolution. Non-white and non-Western holidays (Ramadan, Kwanzaa, Cinco de Mayo) are now observed in schools and by businesses and some local governments and national leaders (including President George W. Bush). In San Jose, California, a proposal to construct a public statue to Col. Thomas Fallon, who captured the city for the Americans in the Mexican-American War, was rejected, and a proposal to build a statue to the Aztec god Quetzalcoatl approved instead. Mexican-Americans at a soccer match in Los Angeles in 1998 booed and jeered the playing of the American national anthem before he game. The names of streets and bridges that commemorate white leaders are changed to honor non-whites. "Hate crimes" against non-whites such as the brutal murder of a black man in Jasper, Texas, in 1998 by three white ex-convicts are national front-page news for weeks, and national leaders descend upon the local community to show their solidarity with the victim and work to extirpate the institutionalized "hate" that supposedly caused the crime, while more federal laws against "hate crimes" are demanded. Yet even more brutal

massacres of whites, such as the rape, torture, kidnapping, and murder of four white men and women by two black criminals in Wichita, Kansas, in 2000, are seldom mentioned in the national news and excite no commentary whatsoever. O.J. Simpson, despite overwhelming evidence of his guilt in the murders of his white ex-wife and her friend, is acquitted by a racially mixed jury in which black jurors reject incriminating evidence as "racist," while the verdict is celebrated nationwide by blacks. Does anyone seriously believe that whites in a nation where they have become a numerical minority and are denied the racial consciousness that makes political mobilization and resistance possible could be secure in their own liberty, rights, and physical safety, let alone certain of the survival of their civilization? Whites even today, while they remain a majority, are facing unprecedented physical and political threats that a strong common consciousness would halt and, only a few years ago, would have made impossible.

Is there a realistic chance that whites will develop a common racial consciousness before they are swallowed by the rising tide of non-whites? It is perhaps significant that Shelby Steele wrote that whites today "cannot *openly* have a racial identity." He perhaps knows or suspects that there persists a powerful hidden white racial identity. If white racial consciousness is forbidden and does not exist, there is certainly a powerful racial subconscious among whites, as evidenced by patterns of school attendance, housing, church membership, marriage, and even voting. The "color blindness" about which conservatives like to chirp does not exist wherever whites (or other races) are free to choose their own associations. Whites, of course, will often avoid explaining or defending their preferences for association with their own race in racial terms. They move to the suburbs because tax rates and crime rates are lower; they send their children to mainly white schools because these schools are better; they attend the churches they do because those are the churches of their parents and their friends. But all such explanations—lower taxes and less crime, better schools, the habits of one's parents and friends—have obvious racial dimensions and correlations. A recent study by the Harvard Civil Rights Project, the *Washington Post* reports, shows that today "schools are almost as segregated as they were when the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. was assassinated." The segregation is due not to legally enforced discrimination but to the voluntary residence and attendance preferences of whites, who

simply abandon communities and schools when non-whites arrive.[5] For much the same reason, Christian churches also remain racially exclusive. "Just 8 percent of Christian churches in the United States are multi-racial, defined as one ethnic group making up no more than 80 percent of the membership, according to a 2002 study."[6]

Voting behavior shows the same racial patterns (see "Ethnopolitics: Ethnic and Racial Implications of the 2000 Election," p. 85). Just as whites separate themselves in neighborhoods, schools, and churches according to race, so they separate themselves by race in the parties, candidates, and (presumably) political ideologies they support.

Moreover, as non-white immigrants occupy more and more of the national territory, "white flight" extends not just from city to suburb and suburb to countryside but from region to region. As University of Michigan demographer William H. Frey and reporter Jonathan Tilove wrote in the *New York Times Magazine* (August 20, 1995):

> For every immigrant who arrives [in large metropolitan areas], a white person leaves. Look collectively at the New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, and Boston metropolitan areas—5 of the top 11 immigration destinations. In the last half of the '80s, for every 10 immigrants who arrived, 9 residents left for points elsewhere. And most of those leaving were non-Hispanic whites…. The places that whites were leaving for were metro areas like Tampa-St. Petersburg, Seattle, Phoenix, Atlanta, and Las Vegas, all of which attract relatively few immigrants.
>
> The trend constitutes a new, larger form of white flight. Unlike in the old version, whites this time are not just fleeing the cities for the suburbs. They are leaving entire metropolitan areas and states—whole regions—for white destinations. And new census estimates indicate that this pattern of flight from big immigration destinations has become even more pronounced in the '90s.

And, in marriages, the most vital relationship of all for the survival of a race, the overwhelming fact, despite constant acclamation by racial liberals of increases in interracial unions, is that whites continue to marry outside their own race less than any other race, and they do so in negligible numbers. The 2000 Census reports that only 3.5 percent of whites marry

non-whites. Given the ending of legal barriers to interracial marriage nearly 40 years ago and the immense increase of the nation's non-white population since that time, this persistent preference of whites for marriage partners of their own race is strong evidence of their enduring racial identity as whites.

The clear existence of a white racial *sub*conscious means that the problem for whites is mainly to bring what it contains into consciousness, that what the advocates of a revived and reinvigorated racial consciousness must work for is analogous to what Freudian psychoanalysts claim to be doing in treating neurotics—to bring what has been repressed into consciousness. Whites today are indeed neurotic, because such a major part of their nature has been denied and repressed so long. They need to learn that race, as much as sex, is part of human nature and the human condition, that it can no more be expelled or denied or excluded than any other important fact or force of nature. As with every other such fact and force, human beings need to construct their social and political arrangements with nature in mind, and not build on fantasies that ignore or deny nature. Whites need to learn also that racial consciousness is no more a license for repression, exploitation, hatred, and violence than recognition of the reality and importance of sex is a license for rape, seduction, and debauchery. Obviously there are criminal and pathological elements that will use sex and race for criminal and pathological ends, but their existence does nothing to diminish the legitimacy and urgency of what those who demand their recognition for healthy purposes are seeking.

Finally, whites need to form their racial consciousness in conformity not only with what we now know about the scientific reality of race but also with the moral and political traditions of Western Man—White Man. The purpose of white racial consciousness and identity is not simply to serve as a balance against the aggression and domination of other races but also to preserve, protect, and help revitalize the legacy of the civilization that our own ancestors created and handed down to us, for its own sake, because it is ours, and because, by the standards of the values and ideals we as a race and a civilization have articulated, it is better. After generations of denial and distortion, what we have permitted to be expelled and repressed now returns, and we now know again, as our ancestors once knew also, that in the absence of the race that created that legacy, it would never have existed at all. If the legacy is to pass on to our own descendants, it will be because

we as white men and women understood who we were, what it was we created, how it came to exist, and how it will endure.

**Notes**

1. J. Philippe Rushton, *Race, Evolution, and Behavior: A Life History Perspective* (3rd ed.; Port Huron, Mich.: Charles Darwin Institute, 2000), p. 305. The rest of the definition should also be included: "A variety, a subspecies, a subdivision of a species characterized by a more or less distinctive combination of physical traits transmitted by descent. A genetically distinct inbreeding division within a species. Often used interchangeably with the term subspecies. In humans the three major races of Caucasoid, Mongoloid, and Negroid can be distinguished on the basis of skeletal morphology, hair and facial features, and molecular genetic information."

2. Arthur R. Jensen, *Straight Talk about Mental Tests* (New York: Free Press, 1981), p. 198.

3. Robert Nisbet, *The Social Philosophers: Community and Conflict in Western Thought* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973), pp. 306–308.

4. William H. McNeill, *Polyethnicity and National Unity in World History: The Donald G. Creighton Lectures, 1985* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986), pp. 6–7, argues that "civilized" societies have been ethnically heterogeneous, as opposed to "barbarous" societies, which tend to be ethnically homogeneous. The ethnically heterogeneous "civilized societies have nearly always subordinated some human groups to others of a different ethnic background, thereby creating a laminated polyethnic structure." In his usage, the term "ethnic" refers to groups of distinctive culture and language as well as those of distinct biological descent or race.

5. "U.S. School Segregation Now at '69 Level," *Washington Post*, January 18, 2004.

6. "Minority Pastors Preach Diversity," *Washington Post*, April 4, 2004.

*This is adapted from the introduction to* Race and the American Prospect. *It is reprinted with permission from the Occidental Press, Box 695, Mount Airy, Maryland 21771.*

* * *

Samuel Francis died in February 2005, but the essays in this collection are very much alive. They address the most important issues facing the people of the West, here in the United States as well as in Europe, New Zealand, and Australia, indeed wherever Western Man and the civilization he has created are found. Dr. Francis not only identified the root causes of our malaise, but he outlined practical steps to preserve, protect, and help revitalize our civilization. This book is a survival guide for men and women of the West. — Wayne Lutton, co-author, *The Immigration Time Bomb* and Editor, *The Social Contract*

Reading these essays by Sam, I am made aware for the hundredth time of how much we have lost by his untimely passing. What emerges from these discussions of race is nothing vulgar or demagogic but a mental seriousness that is almost entirely absent from today's political journalism. Sam not only broaches what in a cowardly, mendacious society one is taught to avoid but he addresses his task with brilliance and even a certain delicacy. His efforts to make us think continue to enlighten those noble few who will listen. — Paul Gottfried, Professor of Humanities, Elizabethtown College

The poet Robert Burns coined the expression "gentleman and scholar": Sam Francis was also a journalist. Nothing engaged his analytical and expository talents more than the science and politics of race. No subject was more vital in his lifetime, nor more taboo. This book is a well-organized and illuminatingly-annotated selection of Francis's thinking on race. It is valuable today; it may well prove seminal in the future. — Peter Brimelow, Editor, VDARE.COM

This collection comprises some of Sam's most provocative, controversial—and to his critics, most infuriating—work. Here is Sam Francis at his analytical best, fearlessly addressing taboo subjects in columns, essays and speeches that sent his limp-wristed conservative Republican colleagues running for the comfort of their mothers' skirts. These commentaries show that far from being the bigot imagined by his enemies, Sam Francis never penned a single line of racial hatred, but sought simply to protect and conserve his own people and culture. This compilation is essential reading for understanding the importance of race in politics, and demonstrates why

Sam Francis remains so influential on the American right. — Jerry Woodruff, Editor, *Middle American News*